



## 2017-2021 District Strategic Plan Alignment

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
<p><b>Goal 1:</b> We will increase college going for the Los Angeles region through enhanced outreach to community and educational partners and expanded access to educational programs that meet community and student needs.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> We will expand educational opportunities to local high school students by increasing the number of courses offered through dual enrollment.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1.1.1:</b> Number of sections offered through dual enrollment</p>	<p>The proposed methodology is to determine a 25% increase from the number of sections available in 2016 for dual enrolled students.</p>	<p>SIS/PeopleSoft</p>
		<p><b>Measure 1.1.2:</b> Number of students who are dual enrolled</p>	<p><b>2017: ≈ 11,000 students or 8.6% of high schoolers</b> <b>TARGET: 13,750 students.</b> The goal was determined by calculating a 25% increase (2,750) from number of students in 2016 who are dual enrolled (11,000 + 2,750 = 13,750).</p>	<p>SIS/PeopleSoft</p>
	<p><b>Objective 2:</b> We will fully implement the LA College Promise and will seek to expand the promise to additional school districts and municipalities in the service area.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1.2.1:</b> Number of new LA College Promise students</p>	<p><b>2017: ≈ 4,000 students</b> <b>TARGET: 6,000 students</b> The goal was determined by calculating a 50% increase (2,000) from 2017 student counts (4,000 + 2,000 = 6,000).</p>	<p>SIS/PeopleSoft</p>
		<p><b>Measure 1.2.2:</b> Percentage of LAUSD schools served by LA College Promise program</p>	<p><b>TARGET: 90% of LAUSD Schools (Secondary &amp; Charter Schools)</b></p>	<p>SIS/PeopleSoft</p>

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 3:</b> We, in partnership with Los Angeles Regional Adult Education Consortium, will increase educational opportunities to nontraditional students through the expansion of noncredit adult education courses focused on skills improvement and vocational training.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1.3.1:</b> Number of noncredit adult education sections</p>	<p>2012: 539, 2013: 519, 2014: 518, 2015: 552, 2016: 602  <b>TARGET: 753 sections.</b> The goal was determined by calculating a 25% increase (150.5) from 2016 section counts and rounding to the nearest whole number (<math>602 + 150.5 = 752.5 = 753</math>).</p>	DataMart
		<p><b>Measure 1.3.2:</b> Number of students enrolled in noncredit adult education courses</p>	<p>2012: 9,668; 2013: 9,698; 2014: 9,441; 2015: 11,405; 2016: 11,556  <b>TARGET: 14,445 students.</b> The goal was determined by calculating a 25% increase (2,889) from 2016 student counts (<math>11,556 + 2,889 = 14,445</math>).</p>	DataMart
	<p><b>Objective 4:</b> We will improve outreach strategies for new and returning students through effective marketing and branding that increases the recognition of LACCD colleges and programs as premier in the community.</p>	<p><b>Measure 1.4.1:</b> Number of first-time students</p>	<p>The proposed methodology is to add the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = ?</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = ?</math>) and round up to the nearest whole number (<math>? + ? = ? = ?</math>).</p>	
		<p><b>Measure 1.4.2:</b> Number of returning students</p>	<p>The proposed methodology is to add the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = ?</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = ?</math>) and round up to the nearest whole number (<math>? + ? = ? = ?</math>).</p>	

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<b>Measure 1.4.3:</b> Percentage of students whose decision to enroll was impacted by newspaper, radio, or television advertisements	<b>2017: 16.1% endorsed very much or quite a bit</b> <b>TARGET: 25% of students endorsing very much or quite a bit.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey
		<b>Measure 1.4.3:</b> Percentage of students whose decision to enroll was impacted by social media	<b>2017: 19.3% endorsed very much and quite a bit</b> <b>TARGET: 25% of students endorsing very much or quite a bit.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey

DRAFT

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
<p><b>Goal 2:</b> We will develop a premier learning environment that places students as the first priority in the institution and effectively supports students in attaining educational goals.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> We will have an excellent campus climate by improving student services, providing a safe learning environment, and by establishing a higher standard for customer service.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2.1.1:</b> Percentage of student services with high satisfaction ratings (80% of students stating that they are somewhat or very satisfied). <i>(Student services include: Admissions and Records, Assessment and Placement Services, Associated Student Organization/Union, Athletics, Bookstore, Business and Fiscal Office, CalWORKs, Career and Employment Center, Child Care Center, College Sheriff, Disabled Student Programs and Services, EOPS or CARE, Financial Aid Office, Food Services, Foster Youth, General College Counseling Services, Health Center, Instructional or Computer Labs, International Student Program and Services, Library, On-campus Orientation, Online Orientation, PUENTE, Transfer Center, Tutoring Services, Umoja, and Veterans Office)</i></p>	<p>Survey Options: Very Satisfied, Somewhat Satisfied, Not Satisfied, Not Applicable</p> <p>2014: average of 59% were somewhat to very satisfied with services</p> <p>2017: average of 60% were somewhat to very satisfied with services</p> <p><b>TARGET: 90% of student services having high satisfaction ratings.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.</p>	<p>Student Survey</p>
		<p><b>Measure 2.1.2:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, I feel safe and secure at this college?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A</p> <p>2014: 10.1% disagree or strongly disagree</p> <p>2017: 7.2% disagree or strongly disagree</p> <p><b>TARGET: 3.6% of students stating they disagree or strongly disagree.</b> The goal was determined by reducing 2017 ratings by half, 50%.</p>	<p>Student Survey</p>

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 2:</b> We will create an environment that is respectful to the needs of diverse populations and that embraces the diversity of opinions found in a global society.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2.2.1:</b> At this college, how often do you engage with students who differ from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or ethnic background?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never  <b>2014: 41.5% said often or sometimes</b>  <b>2017: 78.6% said often or sometimes</b>  <b>TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.</b>            The goal was determined by consensus.</p>	<p>Student Survey</p>
		<p><b>Measure 2.2.2:</b> My experience at this college, in and out of class, has improved my ability to understand people of other racial, cultural, or religious backgrounds?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Very much, Quite a Bit, Some, Very Little  <b>2014: 75% said very much or quite a bit</b>  <b>2017: 77.3% said very much or quite a bit</b>  <b>TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.</b>            The goal was determined by consensus.</p>	<p>Student Survey</p>
	<p><b>Objective 3:</b> We will increase fulltime enrollment for students through the development of flexible programs focused on working students and students with barriers to attending traditionally scheduled programs.</p> <p>Strong Workforce Program Metric - Number of course enrollments: The number of registrations in courses (may include duplicated students)</p>	<p><b>Measure 2.3.1:</b> Number and percentage of students enrolled full time</p>	<p><b>2012: 35,082 &amp; 23.2%,</b>  <b>2013: 36,161 &amp; 23.5%,</b>  <b>2014: 36,719 &amp; 24.2%,</b>  <b>2015: 36,385 &amp; 23.5%,</b>  <b>2016: 34,311 &amp; 22.4%</b>  <b>TARGET: 26% of students enrolled full time.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>4\sigma = 2.6\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 23.4\%</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number</p>	<p>DataMart</p>

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<b>Measure 2.7.3:</b> Number of course enrollments	(23.4% + 2.6% = 26%).  <b>2011: 887,407, 2012: 749,753, 2013: 749,919, 2014: 801,331, 2015: 817,681</b>  <b>TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in number of course enrollments.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics
	<b>Objective 4:</b> We will review and refine curriculum and programs to ensure that they are responsive to student needs and meeting the economic, industry, and societal needs of the region.	<b>Measure 2.4.1:</b> Number of programs with zero completions	<b>TARGET: Zero programs.</b> The goal was determined by consensus, and will not include completions for the first four years a program is offered.	SIS/PeopleSoft
	<b>Objective 5:</b> We will provide facilities and technologies to effectively serve and connect with the modern student and enhance regular and effective communication.	<b>Measure 2.5.1:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, this college's Wi-Fi is reliable?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree  <b>2014: 71.1% agree or strongly agree</b>  <b>2017: 63.1% agree or strongly agree</b>  <b>TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<p><b>Measure 2.5.2:</b> In general, to what extent do you agree with the statement, my instructors adequately use available technology in and out of the classroom?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</p> <p>2014: 88.6% agree or strongly agree</p> <p>2017: 88.1% agree or strongly agree</p> <p><b>TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.</p>	
		<p><b>Measure 2.5.3:</b> How often do you use email, social media, or text messaging to communicate with an instructor?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never, Not Applicable</p> <p>2014: 64.6% said often or sometimes</p> <p>2017: 75% said often or sometimes</p> <p><b>TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.</p>	Student Survey
		<p><b>Measure 2.5.4:</b> How often do you use email, social media, text messaging, or this college's website to keep informed about college events?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never, Not Applicable</p> <p>2017: 67.5% said often or sometimes</p> <p><b>TARGET: 3.5 survey rating.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.</p>	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 6:</b> We will increase access to higher education by assisting students in gaining access to financial aid and ensuring that all students, whether in-person or online, receive orientation, multiple measures assessment, and educational planning.</p>	<p><b>Measure 2.6.1:</b> Percentage of eligible students receiving Pell Grant</p>	<p>2011: 71%, 2012: 71%, 2013: 71%, 2014: 70%, 2015: 66%</p> <p><b>TARGET: 74%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 4.3\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 69.8\%</math>) and rounding to the nearest whole number (<math>69.8\% + 4.3\% = 74.1\% = 74\%</math>).</p>	DataMart
		<p><b>Measure 2.6.2:</b> Percentage of new students completing an English assessment before or in the first term or being placed using a multiple measure</p>	<p>2011: 72%, 2012: 75%, 2013: 73%, 2014: 78%, 2015: 78%</p> <p><b>TARGET: 81%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 5.5\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 75.2\%</math>) and rounding to the nearest whole number (<math>75.2\% + 5.5\% = 80.7\% = 81\%</math>).</p>	
		<p><b>Measure 2.6.3:</b> Percentage of new students completing a math assessment before or in the first term or being placed using a multiple measure</p>	<p>2011: 72%, 2012: 75%, 2013: 73%, 2014: 78%, 2015: 78%</p> <p><b>TARGET: 84%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 7.1\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 76.8\%</math>) and</p>	

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			rounding to the nearest whole number (76.8% + 7.1% = 83.9% = 84%).	
		<b>Measure 2.6.4:</b> Percentage of new students completing orientation	<b>2014: 58%, 2015: 72%</b> <b>TARGET: 95%.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.	
		<b>Measure 2.6.4:</b> Percentage of new students creating an academic plan	<b>2014: 66%, 2015: 77%</b> <b>TARGET: 95%.</b> The goal was determined by consensus.	
	<b>Objective 7:</b> We will increase student persistence and successful course completion through effective practices in the classroom and through student services.	<b>Measure 2.7.1:</b> Persistence rate, Fall to Spring	<b>2011: 86%, 2012-13: 87%, 2014: 88%, 2015: 89%</b> <b>TARGET: 90%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations ( $2\sigma = 2.3\%$ ) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years ( $\mu = 87.4\%$ ) and rounding up to the nearest whole number ( $87.4\% + 2.3\% = 89.7\% = 90\%$ ).	SIS/PeopleSoft
		<b>Measure 2.7.2:</b> Persistence rate, Fall to Fall	<b>2011: 74%</b> <b>2012-2015: 75%</b> <b>TARGET: 76%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations ( $2\sigma = .9\%$ ) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years ( $\mu = 74.8\%$ ) and rounding up to the nearest whole number ( $74.8\% + .9\% = 75.7\% = 76\%$ ).	SIS/PeopleSoft

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<p><b>Measure 2.7.3:</b> Persistence rate, three consecutive terms</p> <p>Scorecard Metric – Persistence: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who enrolled in the first three consecutive terms.</p>	<p><b>Scorecard, Overall (State):</b>  2006: 62% (70%), 2007: 64% (71%), 2008: 66% (72%),  2009: 72% (73%), 2010: 76% (76%).</p> <p><b>TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in persistence.</b></p>	Scorecard
		<p><b>Measure 2.7.4:</b> Percentage of new, first-time students successfully completing at least one English and math class in their first year</p>	<p>2011: 17%, 2012: 17%,  2013: 19%, 2014: 24%,  2015: 26%</p> <p><b>TARGET: 29%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 8.3\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 20.6\%</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>20.6\% + 8.3\% = 28.9\% = 29\%</math>).</p>	
		<p><b>Measure 2.7.5:</b> Successful course completion rates</p>	<p>2011: 63.8%, 2012: 67.5%,  2013: 65.9%, 2014: 65.7%,  2015: 65.8%</p> <p><b>TARGET: Exceed statewide performance in in successful course completion rates.</b></p>	IEPI

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
<p><b>Goal 3:</b> We will increase student completion to exceed the statewide performance measures and increase attainment of milestones indicative of academic success.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> We will decrease time to completion by enhancing academic and student support programs.</p> <p>CCCO Objective 3   Decrease the average number of units accumulated by CCC students earning associate's degrees, from approximately 87 total units (the most recent system-wide average) to 79 total units—the average among the quintile of colleges showing the strongest performance on this measure.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3.1.1:</b> Average number of units accumulated by students earning an associate's degree</p>	<p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 79 units.</b></p>	
		<p><b>Measure 3.1.2:</b> Median time to complete a degree</p>	<p>2011: 4.5, 2012-2015: 4.4</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 4 years.</b> The goal was determined by subtracting the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = .1</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 4.4</math>) and rounding down to the nearest whole number (<math>4.4 + .1 = 4.3 = 4</math>).</p>	SIS/PeopleSoft
		<p><b>Measure 3.1.3:</b> Median time to complete a certificate</p>	<p>2013-2015: 3.7</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3 years.</b></p>	SIS/PeopleSoft
		<p><b>Measure 3.1.4:</b> Graduation rates of full-time, first-time degree/certificate seeking undergraduates with 150% of normal time to completion</p>	<p>2011: 17%, 2012: 15%, 2013: 18%, 2014: 21%, 2015: 23%</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 26%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 6.4\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 18.8\%</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>18.8\% + 6.4\% = 25.2\% = 26\%</math>).</p>	IPEDS

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 2:</b> We will increase completion of degrees and certificates.</p> <p>CCCO Objective 1   Increase by at least 20 percent the number of CCC students annually who acquire associates degrees, credentials, certificates, or specific skill sets that prepare them for an in-demand job.</p> <p>Strong Workforce Program Metric - Number of students who got a degree or certificate: Unique individuals who completed a credit or noncredit local certificate, credit or noncredit Chancellor’s Office approved certificate, associate degree, or applied bachelor’s degree</p>	<p><b>Measure 3.2.1:</b> Completion rates  <b>NEED TO VERIFY THAT THIS IS A DISTRICT SET STANDARD</b></p> <p>Scorecard Metric – Completion: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes.</p>	<p>3 year completion for 2011: 15%, 2012: 14%, 2013: 13%, 2014: 12%, 2015: 16% &amp; 6 year completion for 2011-2012: 35%, 2013: 33%, 2014: 30%, 2015: 33%</p> <p><b>Scorecard completion (overall): 2006-2007: 42%, 2008: 41%. 2009: 40%, 2010: 43%.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by District): 53%.</b></p>	
		<p><b>Measure 3.2.2:</b> Number of students who got a degree or certificate</p>	<p>2011: 8,372, 2012: 9,449, 2013: 10,200, 2014: 11,055, 2015: 12,957</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 20% increase, 15,549 students.</b>  <math>(12,957 \cdot .20) + 12,957 = 15,548.4 = 15,549.</math></p>	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics
		<p><b>Measure 3.2.3:</b> Number of degrees conferred</p>	<p>2012: 6075, 2013: 7037, 2014: 7401, 2015: 9088, 2016: 10992</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 11,999 degrees.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2 \sigma = 3,880.4</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 8,118.6</math>) (<math>8,118.6 + 3,880.4 = 11,999</math>).</p>	Datamart

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<b>Measure 3.2.4:</b> Number of certificates conferred	<p>2012: 4585, 2013: 5185, 2014: 5936, 2015: 8400, 2016: 9259</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 10,770 certificates.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 4,097.2</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 6,673</math>) and rounding to the nearest whole number (<math>6,673 + 4,097.2 = 10,770.2 = 10,770</math>).</p>	Datamart
	<p><b>Objective 3:</b> We will increase the number of students transferring to four-year institutions.</p> <p>CCCO Objective 2   Increase by 35 percent the number of CCC students system-wide transferring annually to a UC or CSU.</p> <p>Strong Workforce Program Metric - Number of students who transferred: Unique individuals who transferred to a four-year institution</p>	<b>Measure 3.3.3:</b> Number of students who transfer to California Public, 4-year institutions (UC or CSU)	<p>2011: 4,628; 2012: 3,847; 2013: 4,855; 2014: 5,699; 2015: 5,395</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 35% increase, 7,283 students.</b> (<math>5,395 \times .35</math>) + <math>5,395 = 7,283.3 = 7,283</math>.</p>	EPIE, Institutional Performance & Accountability page
		<b>Measure 3.3.4:</b> Number of students who transfer to a 4-year institution	<p>2010: 8,309, 2011: 7,523, 2012: 7,693, 2013: 8,975, 2014: 7,445</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 35% increase, 10,050 students.</b> (<math>7,445 \times .35</math>) + <math>7,445 = 10,050.75 = 10,050</math>.</p>	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 4:</b> We will increase career and job placement rates in the field of study by enhancing business and industry partnerships, internships, and employment opportunities.</p> <p>CCCO Objective 4   Increase the percent of exiting CTE students who report being employed in their field of study, from the most recent statewide average of 60 percent to an improved rate of 69 percent—the average among the quintile of colleges showing the strongest performance on this measure in the most recent administration of the CTE Outcomes Survey.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3.4.1:</b> Percentage of students completing more than eight units in CTE courses in 6 years</p> <p>Scorecard Metric – Career Technical Education: Percentage of students completing more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education (or apprenticeship ) in a single discipline for the first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who completed a degree, certificate, apprenticeship or transfer-related outcomes.</p>	<p><b>LACCD Scorecard (State):</b> 2006: 48% (51%), 2007: 47% (51%), 2008: 47% (50%), 2009: 49% (52%), 2010: 52% (54%).</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in percentage of students completing more than eight units in CTE courses.</b></p>	Scorecard
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.2:</b> Number of Skills Certificates awarded</p>	<p>2012: 1,575; 2013: 1,533; 2014: 1,884; 2015: 2,744; 2016: 3,520</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3,972 skills certificates.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 1,720.6</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 2,251.2</math>) and rounding to the nearest whole number (<math>2,251.2 + 1,720.6 = 3,971.8 = 3,972</math>).</p>	EPIE, Degrees and Certificates Awarded Document
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.3:</b> Number of students currently employed or self-employed after completing CTE programs</p> <p>Responses are based on the question, “What best describes your current employment status?”</p>	<p><b>LACCD data are incomplete (State) – 2012: (75%), 2013: (77%), 2014: (78%), 2015: (80%)</b></p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in number of students currently employed or self-</b></p>	Career & Technical Education Outcomes Survey Reports

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.4:</b> Median percentage change in wages for student who completed higher level CTE coursework (Skills Builder)</p> <p>Scorecard Metric – Skills Builder: The median percentage change in wages for students who completed higher level CTE coursework in 2013-2014 and left the system without receiving any type of traditional outcome such as transfer to a four year college or completion of a degree or certificate.</p>	<p>employed.</p> <p>LACCD Scorecard (State):  2010/11: 6.7% (10%),  2011/12: 8.2% (11%),  2012/13: 8.0% (13.4),  2013/14: 18.5% (22.6%)</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in the median percentage change in wages.</b></p>	<p>Scorecard / Datamart</p>
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.5:</b> Employment rate for students in the second and fourth fiscal quarter after exit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employed in the second fiscal quarter after exit: Employment rate for exiting students in the second fiscal quarter after leaving the community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)*</li> <li>• Employed in the fourth fiscal quarter after exit: Employment rate for exiting students in the fourth fiscal quarter after leaving the community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)*</li> </ul>	<p>2<sup>nd</sup> fiscal quarter – 2010: 61% (63%), 2011: 63% (64%), 2012: 65% (65%), 2013: 64% (66%), 2014: 66% (67%)</p> <p>4<sup>th</sup> fiscal quarter – 2010: 62% (63%), 2011: 63% (64%), 2012: 65% (65%), 2013: 65% (66%), 2014: 66% (67%)</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in the employment rate for students in the second and fourth quarter.</b></p>	<p>CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics</p>
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.6:</b> Percentage of students who report being employed in their field of study</p> <p>Job closely related to field of study: The proportion of students who reported</p>	<p>LACCD data are incomplete (State) - 2011: (67%); 2012: (71%); 2013: (68%); 2014: (69%); 2015: (69%)</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by</b></p>	<p>CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics</p> <p>Career &amp; Technica</p>

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		that their current job is close or very close to their field of study (based on responses in the CTE Outcomes Survey)	<b>CCCO): 69%.</b>	Education Outcomes Survey Reports
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.7:</b> Median earning in the second fiscal quarter after exit</p> <p>Median earnings in the second fiscal quarter after exit: Earnings for exiting students in the second fiscal quarters after leaving the community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)*</p>	<p>LACCD (State) - 2010: 7,316 (18,324); 2011: 6,967 (17,629); 2012: 7,311 (16,776); 2013: 7,070 (16,351); 2014: 7,477 (17,438)</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in median earnings in the 2<sup>nd</sup> fiscal quarter after exit.</b></p>	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.8:</b> Median change in earnings for exiting students, one year before and one year after exiting the community college system</p> <p>Median change in earnings: Percentage change in earnings for exiting students, one year before and one year after exiting the California community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)**</p>	<p>LACCD (State) - 2010: 9% (9%), 2011: 15% (15%), 2012: 18% (21%), 2013: 27% (28%), 2014: 38% (36%)</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in median change in earnings.</b></p>	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics
		<p><b>Measure 3.4.9:</b> Proportion of exiting students who attained a living wage</p> <p>Attained a living wage: Proportion of exiting completing and skills-builder students who attained the living wage for a single individual in the college's Doing What Matters region (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file and Insight Center for Community Economic Development data)</p>	<p>LACCD (State) - 2010: 41% (49%), 2011: 39% (48%), 2012: 40% (47%), 2013: 39% (46%), 2014: 41% (48%)</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in proportion of exiting students who attain a living wage.</b></p>	CalPass/Strong Workforce Program Metrics

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 5:</b> We will increase the percentage students completing transfer-level English and mathematics among those who begin at courses below transfer-level.</p> <p>Scorecard Metric – Transfer Level Achievement: The percent of first-time students in 2014-15 who complete 6 units and attempt any Math or English in their first year who complete a transfer-level course in Math or English in their first or second year.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3.5.1:</b> Percentage of students completing transfer-level English, among those who begin at courses below transfer-level</p>	<p>First Year, Cohort (State) 2010: 18% (30%), 2011: 17% (31%), 2012: 17% (33%), 2013: 22% (36%), 2014: 26% (38%)</p> <p>Second Year, Cohort (State) 2010: 36% (48%), 2011: 36% (50%), 2012: 39% (53%), 2013: 43% (55%), 2014: 46% (56%)</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in Transfer level achievement in English.</b></p>	
		<p><b>Measure 3.5.2:</b> Percentage of students completing transfer-level mathematics, among those who begin at courses below transfer-level</p>	<p>First Year, Cohort (State) 2010: 8% (15%), 2011: 8% (14%), 2012: 8% (15%), 2013: 8% (16%), 2014: 8% (17%)</p> <p>Second Year, Cohort (State) 2010: 16% (25%), 2011: 16% (25%), 2012: 16% (27%), 2013: 16% (27%), 2014: 17% (29%)</p> <p><b>Proposed target: Exceed statewide performance in Transfer level achievement in Math.</b></p>	

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 6:</b> We will increase equity in the attainment of student milestones.</p> <p><b>NEED TO VERIFY THAT THESE ARE THE APPROPRIATE MILESTONES TO USE—the milestones currently are not included as stand-alone measures and they should be included once the appropriate milestones are identified.</b></p> <p>CCCO Objective 5   Reduce equity gaps across all of the above measures through faster improvements among traditionally underrepresented student groups, with the goal of cutting achievement gaps by 40 percent within 5 years and fully closing those achievement gaps for good within 10 years.</p>	<p><b>Measure 3.6.1:</b> Percentage of New Student Cohort Completing 6 units (or more) in the first semester Overall and by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity</p>	<p>2012: 53%, 2013: 56%</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 40% decrease in achievement gaps.</b></p>	SIS/PeopleSoft
		<p><b>Measure 3.6.2:</b> Percentage of New Student Cohort Completing 30 Units in 3 Years Overall and by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity</p> <p>Scorecard Metric – 30 Units: Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16 who achieved at least 30 units.</p>	<p>2011: 59%, 2012: 61%, 2013: 62%, 2014-2015: 63%</p> <p><b>Scorecard, Overall (State): 2006: 63% (66%), 2007: 64% (67%), 2008: 63% (67%), 2009: 66% (68%), 2010: 68% (69%).</b></p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 40% decrease in achievement gaps.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed milestone target: Exceed statewide performance.</b></p>	SIS/PeopleSoft  Scorecard
		<p><b>Measure 3.6.3:</b> Percentage of New Student Cohort Completing 60 Units in 3 Years Overall and by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity</p>	<p>2011: 27%, 2012: 28%, 2013: 30%, 2014-2015: 29% (overall)</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 40% decrease in achievement gaps.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed milestone target: 31%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 2.3\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 28.6\%</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>28.6\% + 2.3\% = 30.9\% = 31\%</math>).</p>	SIS/PeopleSoft

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<p><b>Measure 3.6.4:</b> Percentage of New Student Cohort Successfully Completing English 101 (or above) in 3 Years Overall and by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity</p>	<p>2011: 23%, 2012: 24%, 2013-2014: 26%, 2015: 28% (overall)</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 40% decrease in achievement gaps.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed milestone target: 30%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 3.9\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 25.4\%</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>25.4\% + 3.9\% = 29.3\% = 30\%</math>).</p>	SIS/PeopleSoft
		<p><b>Measure 3.6.5:</b> Percentage of New Student Cohort Successfully Completing Math 125 (or above) in 3 Years Overall and by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity</p>	<p>2011: 31%, 2012: 34%, 2013: 33%, 2014: 31%, 2015: 34% (overall)</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 40% decrease in achievement gaps.</b></p> <p><b>Proposed milestone target: 36%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 3.0\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 32.6\%</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>32.6\% + 3.0\% = 35.6\% = 36\%</math>).</p>	SIS/PeopleSoft

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<p><b>Measure 3.6.6:</b> Completion Rate (i.e., certificate, degree, or transfer) in 3 Years Overall and by Age, Gender, and Ethnicity</p>	<p>2011: 15%, 2012: 14%, 2013: 13%, 2014: 12%, 2015: 16% (overall)</p> <p><b>Proposed target (set by CCCO): 40% decrease in achievement gaps.</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Proposed milestone target: 18%.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 3.2\%</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last 5 years (<math>\mu = 14.0\%</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>14.0\% + 3.2\% = 17.2\% = 18\%</math>).</p>	SIS/PeopleSoft

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
<p><b>Goal 4:</b> We will improve organizational effectiveness at the ESC and among the colleges through streamlined processes, minimized duplication of efforts, and enhanced communication and training.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> We will invest in professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators to enhance work performance, broaden skills for leadership and career advancement, leverage academic programs, and allow for effective and clear career pathways for all employees.</p>	<p><b>Measure 4.1.1:</b> Funds allocated and spent for professional development</p>		Human Resources
		<p><b>Measure 4.1.2:</b> Tuition reimbursement funds distributed to employees</p>		Human Resources
		<p><b>Measure 4.1.3:</b> Number of employees reclassified to a higher position <i>*I am unsure if this is possible or tracked</i></p>		Human Resources
		<p><b>Possible Measure 4.1.4?:</b> Number and types of professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and administrators <b>Questions for Colleges:</b> How are professional development opportunities tracked?</p>		<i>This is a measure that no one, to our knowledge, keeps track of.</i>
	<p><b>Objective 2:</b> We will improve recruiting, hiring, orientation and evaluation processes, and improve the customer service provided to all employees.  <i>The objective is hard to measure directly as it is related to improving a process. Included in the measures are only outcomes that can be tracked over time. We may need to explore other sources of information.</i></p>	<p><b>Measure 4.2.1:</b> Number of new hires</p>		Human Resources
		<p><b>Measure 4.2.2:</b> Number of employee evaluations completed annually</p>		Human Resources
	<p><b>Objective 3:</b> We will improve processes to increase responsiveness to and within colleges, limit barriers, and accelerate completion of required business processes and tasks.</p>	<p><b>Measure 4.3.1:</b> Percentage of departments with high satisfaction ratings of responding to requests in a timely manner (80% of people stating that agree or strongly agree).</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree <i>2015/16: average of 69.8% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement</i></p>	ESC Services Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><i>(ESC Departments: Chancellor’s Office, Deputy Chancellor’s Office, ADA Compliance Administration, Business Services, Diversity Programs and Services, Information Technology, Board of Trustees, Attendance Accounting, Curriculum Support, Dolores Huerta Institute, Institutional Effectiveness, Student Success, CalWORKs, Workforce Development, Accounts Payable, Budget and Management Analysis, Central Financial Aid, General Accounting, Internal Audit, Payroll, Bond Programs, Facilities, Real Estate Program, Employee Relations, Employment Services, Operations, Risk Management, Total Wellness Program, General Counsel, Personnel Commission)</i></p> <p>The measures only include measures that are available for the ESC, it is still unknown what information we can track for the colleges.</p>	<p>Or</p> <p>Survey rating of, “The office responds to my queries or requests in a timely manner.”</p>	<p><b>Proposed target: 90% of departments having high satisfaction ratings.</b></p> <p>Or</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 4 survey rating.</b> (if considering only including a selection of ESC departments)</p>	
		<p><b>Measure 4.3.2:</b> Percentage of departments with high satisfaction ratings of keeping other informed about the progress of requests made (80% of people stating that agree or strongly agree).</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree</p> <p>2015/16: average of 66.1% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 90% of departments having high satisfaction ratings.</b></p>	ESC Services Survey
		<p>Or</p> <p>Survey rating of, “The office keeps me informed about the progress of my inquiries or requests.”</p>	<p>Or</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 4 survey rating.</b> (if considering only including a selection of ESC departments)</p>	
		<p><b>Measure 4.3.3:</b> Percentage of departments with high satisfaction ratings of explaining issues in terms that are understandable (80% of people stating that agree or strongly agree).</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree</p> <p>2015/16: average of 68.9% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 90% of departments having high satisfaction ratings.</b></p>	ESC Services Survey
		<p>Or</p> <p>Survey rating of, “The office explains issues in terms that are understandable.”</p>	<p>Or</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 4 survey rating.</b> (if considering only including a selection of ESC departments)</p>	

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<p><b>Measure 4.3.4:</b> Percentage of departments with high overall satisfaction ratings (80% of people stating that agree or strongly agree).</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Survey rating of, "I am satisfied with the performance of the office overall."</p>	<p>departments)</p> <p>Survey Options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree</p> <p>2015/16: average of 66.6% strongly agreed or agreed with the statement</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 90% of departments having high satisfaction ratings.</b></p> <p>Or</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 4 survey rating.</b> (if considering only including a selection of ESC departments)</p>	<p>ESC Services Survey</p>
	<p><b>Objective 4:</b> We will use state-of-the-art technology to improve communication, including the development of an effective website that assists students, employees, and the community in interacting with the District.</p> <p>The objective is hard to measure directly, so measures that reflect a web presence were included.</p>	<p><b>Measure 4.4.1:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, I can easily find the information I need on the college website?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</p> <p>2017: 81.1% agree or strongly agree</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3.5 survey rating.</b></p>	<p>Student Survey</p>
		<p><b>Measure 4.4.2:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, information on the college website is current and accurate?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</p> <p>2017: 84% agree or strongly agree</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3.5 survey rating.</b></p>	<p>Student Survey</p>
		<p><b>Measure 4.4.3:</b> Number of colleges with a social media presence (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) and number of followers.</p>		<p>Internet</p>

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
	<p><b>Objective 5:</b> We will revise all District policies and procedures to implement the Community College League of California model policy.</p> <p>The objective is hard to measure directly as the revision of policies and procedures appear to be a one-time event. Instead measures listed attempt to capture the outcomes of this review process.</p>	<p><b>Measure 4.5.1:</b> Number of policies reviewed in the current cycle</p>		<p>General Counsel</p>
		<p><b>Measure 4.5.2:</b> Policies were posted on-line and were easily accessible</p>		<p>Internet</p>

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
<p><b>Goal 5:</b> We will improve fiscal integrity through enhanced resource development, institutional advancement, and effective use of existing resources.</p>	<p><b>Objective 1:</b> We will enhance communication, support, and collaboration associated with grant development processes for curricular and student support programs.</p> <p><i>It is difficult to directly measure enhancements of communication, support, and collaboration. The measures listed are related to the number of grants received.</i></p>	<p><b>Measure 5.1.1:</b> Number and amount of grants awarded</p>		Finance
		<p><b>Measure 5.1.2:</b> Amount budgeted for specially funded programs</p>		Finance
	<p><b>Objective 2:</b> We will develop community and business partnerships to assist the District in achieving its mission and enhance student success by providing additional support to students and appropriate referrals to external resources for non-academic needs.</p>	<p><b>Possible Measure 5.2.1?:</b> Number and types of community partnerships</p> <p><i>Questions for Colleges: Who on campus or what office keeps track of these types of measures?</i></p>		<p><i>This is a measure that no one, to our knowledge, keeps track of.</i></p>
	<p><b>Objective 3:</b> We will enhance the District and College foundations and improve alumni relations leading to the development of endowments from which additional resources for students and academic and support programs can be drawn.</p> <p><i>It is difficult to directly measure enhancements of communication, support, and collaboration. The measures listed are related to the number of grants received.</i></p>	<p><b>Measure 5.3.1:</b> Foundation annual financial and income statement</p>		<p>Annual financial statements <i>(these are not regularly maintained)</i> and specially funded programs</p>
		<p><b>Measure 5.3.2:</b> Foundation membership</p> <p><i>This measure may be difficult to track by the foundations, it is unclear what type of record-keeping system is in place.</i></p>		Foundations

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source										
		<p><b>Possible Measure 5.3.3?:</b> Foundation activities related to endowment, fundraising, and scholarship award activity</p> <p><b>Question to Colleges:</b> Do your foundations track their activities or events they host? Is that information available somewhere?</p>		<p>This is a measure that no one, to our knowledge, keeps track of.</p>										
	<p><b>Objective 4:</b> We will effectively use District and College resources and implement position control to support the ongoing improvements of academic and student support programs.</p> <p>It is difficult to measure effect use of resources, so the measures included reflect how funds are used relating to classes.</p>	<p><b>Measure 5.4.1:</b> Sources of revenue available for colleges and District (List of all grants, type of revenue by source (federal, state, local, other), and specially funded programs.</p>	<p><b>Expenditures for Specially Funded Programs in</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2011:</td> <td>\$43,290,443,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012:</td> <td>\$39,553,538,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013:</td> <td>\$40,561,872,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014:</td> <td>\$43,315,418,</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015:</td> <td>\$52,019,623</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Proposed target:</b>  <b>\$53,574,732.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = \\$9,826,553.60</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last five years (<math>\mu = \\$43,748,178.80</math>) and rounding to the nearest whole number  <math>(\\$43,748,178.80 + \\$9,826,553.60 = \\$53,574,732.40 = \\$53,574,732).</math></p>	2011:	\$43,290,443,	2012:	\$39,553,538,	2013:	\$40,561,872,	2014:	\$43,315,418,	2015:	\$52,019,623	<p>Final Budget Document</p>
2011:	\$43,290,443,													
2012:	\$39,553,538,													
2013:	\$40,561,872,													
2014:	\$43,315,418,													
2015:	\$52,019,623													
		<p><b>Measure 5.4.2:</b> Faculty Obligation Number (FON)</p>	<p>2011: 1461, 2012: 1445, 2013: 1421, 2014: 1451, 2015: 1519</p>	<p>Financial Accountability Measures</p>										

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<b>Measure 5.4.3: Total FTES</b>	<p>2011: 103,529; 2012: 97,858; 2013: 101,383; 2014: 104,568; 2015: 107,601</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 110,266.</b></p> <p>The goal was determined by adding the value of 2 standard deviations (<math>2\sigma = 7,277.5</math>) to the average or mean performance of the last five years (<math>\mu = 102,987.8</math>) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>102,987.8 + 7,277.5 = 110,265.3 = 110,266</math>).</p>	Attendance & Accountability
		<b>Measure 5.4.4: Expenditures per FTE</b>	<p>2011: \$4,036, 2012: \$4,148, 2013: \$4,305, 2014: \$4,371, 2015: \$4,624</p> <p><b>Proposed target: \$4,399.</b></p> <p>The goal was determined by subtracting the value of 1 standard deviation (<math>\sigma = \\$225.20</math>) from last year's expenditures (\$4,624) and rounding up to the nearest whole number (<math>\\$4,624 - \\$225.20 = \\$4,398.80 = \\$4,399</math>).</p>	Financial Accountability Measures
		<b>Measure 5.4.5: Average class size</b>	<p>2011: 41.0; 2012: 39.9; 2013: 37.7; 2014: 36.5; 2015: 35.2</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 41.</b> The goal was determined by adding the value of 1 standard deviation (<math>\sigma = 2.4</math>) to</p>	Databook-Accountability

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			the average or mean performance of the last five years ( $\mu = 38.1$ ) and rounding up to the nearest whole number ( $38.1 + 2.4 = 40.5 = 41$ ).	
		<b>Measure 5.4.6:</b> Fund balance	2011-12: 14.5%, 2012-13: 13.1%, 2013-14: 13.6%, 2014-15: 13.4%, 2015-16: 20.9% <b>Proposed target: 15.1%.</b> The goal was determined by taking the average or mean performance of the last five years ( $\mu = 15.1\%$ ).	Final Budget Document
	<b>Objective 5:</b> We will improve the resource allocation processes to be integrated with District strategic plan.	<b>Measure 5.5.1:</b> District-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation	Survey Options: Agree, Disagree 2014-16: 39.4% agree	LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Survey
	<b>Objective 6:</b> We will effectively plan and use resources to build and maintain District and College facilities and infrastructure in support of the academic and student support programs.  It is difficult to measure effect use of resources, so the measures included will reflect the condition of facilities and a measure of facility utilization.	<b>Measure 5.6.1:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, buildings are clean and well maintained?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A 2014: 75.5% agree or strongly agree 2017: 73.9% agree or strongly agree <b>Proposed target: 3.5 survey rating.</b>	Student Survey
		<b>Measure 5.6.2:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, restrooms are clean and well maintained?	Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A 2014: 62% agree or strongly agree	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
			<p>2017: 61.2% agree or strongly agree</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3.5 survey rating.</b></p>	
		<p><b>Measure 5.6.3:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, the grounds and public areas are clean and well maintained?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A</p> <p>2014: 81.7% agree or strongly agree</p> <p>2017: 82.3% agree or strongly agree</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3.5 survey rating.</b></p>	Student Survey
		<p><b>Measure 5.6.4:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, learning facilities (equipment, classrooms, and labs) are adequate and up-to-date?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A</p> <p>2014: 69.9% agree or strongly agree</p> <p>2017: 76.1% agree or strongly agree</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3.5 survey rating.</b></p>	Student Survey
		<p><b>Measure 5.6.5:</b> To what extent do you agree with the statement, there are enough labs and study spaces to meet my needs?</p>	<p>Survey Options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, N/A</p> <p>2014: 69.1% agree or strongly agree</p> <p>2017: 74.8% agree or strongly agree</p> <p><b>Proposed target: 3.5 survey rating.</b></p>	Student Survey

Goal	Objective	Proposed Measure	Target	Data Source
		<b>Measure 5.6.6:</b> The capitalization (cap) rate (the ratio of Net Operating Income to property asset value)		Facilities
	<b>Objective 7:</b> We will develop and implement districtwide standards in information technology, facilities, and human resources that apply to all colleges.	<b>Possible Measure 5.7.1?:</b> Accreditation status	<b>July 2016: 8 colleges above FA-W</b> <b>Proposed target: 9 colleges above FA-W.</b> The goal is reflected by the LACCD mission to provide students with an excellent education.	IEPI Website
		<b>Possible Measure 5.7.2?:</b> Overall audit status (Audit Opinion Financial Statement, State Compliance, and Federal Award/Compliance)  A 'yes' indicates the district has achieved (historical) or has set a goal to achieve an 'unmodified' or 'unqualified' independent audit opinion (minimal or no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies).	<b>2013-2015: Yes</b>	IEPI Website

Notes:

**Targets from VISION FOR SUCCESS: STRENGTHENING THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO MEET CALIFORNIA'S NEEDS**

[https://foundationccc.org/Portals/0/Documents/Vision/VisionForSuccess\\_web.pdf](https://foundationccc.org/Portals/0/Documents/Vision/VisionForSuccess_web.pdf)

To meet California's economic and social needs, the CCC system should aim to reach the following system-wide goals by 2022—five years from the publication of this document:

**1 | Increase by at least 20 percent the number of CCC students annually who acquire associates degrees, credentials, certificates, or specific skill sets that prepare them for an in-demand job.** This increase is needed to meet future workforce demand in California, as analyzed by the Centers of Excellence for Labor Market Research. This goal is consistent with the recommendations of the California Strategic Workforce Development Plan. Equally important to the number of students served will be the type of education they receive: programs, awards, and course sequences need to match the needs of regional economies and employers.

**2 | Increase by 35 percent the number of CCC students system-wide transferring annually to a UC or CSU.** This is the increase needed to meet California's future workforce demand for bachelor's degrees, as projected by the Public Policy Institute of California. (In California, occupations requiring bachelor's degrees are growing even faster than jobs requiring associate's degrees or less college.) Meeting this aggressive goal will require the full engagement and partnership of CSU and UC. While ambitious, the pace of improvement envisioned in this goal is not unprecedented: between 2012-13 and 2015-16 (a three-year period), CCC to CSU transfers increased by 32 percent and between Fall 1999 and Fall 2005 (a six-year period), CCC to UC transfers increased by 40 percent.

**3 | Decrease the average number of units accumulated by CCC students earning associate's degrees, from approximately 87 total units (the most recent system-wide average) to 79 total units—the average among the quintile of colleges showing the strongest performance on this measure.** (Associate's degrees typically require 60 units.) Reducing the average number of units-to degree will help more students reach their educational goals sooner, and at less cost to them. It will also free up taxpayer dollars that can be put toward serving more students.

**4 | Increase the percent of exiting CTE students who report being employed in their field of study, from the most recent statewide average of 60 percent to an improved rate of 69 percent—the average among the quintile of colleges showing the strongest performance on this measure in the most recent administration of the CTE Outcomes Survey.** Improvements on this measure would indicate that colleges are providing career education programs that prepare students for available jobs and offering supports that help students find jobs.

**5 | Reduce equity gaps** across all of the above measures through faster improvements among traditionally underrepresented student groups, with the goal of cutting achievement gaps by 40 percent within 5 years and fully closing those achievement gaps for good within 10 years.

**6 | Reduce regional achievement gaps** across all of the above measures through faster improvements among colleges located in regions with the lowest educational attainment of adults, with the ultimate goal of closing regional achievement gaps for good within 10 years.

Below are seven core commitments the CCC system as a whole can make to achieve these ambitious goals and realize its full potential to meet the future workforce needs of California:

- 1 | Focus relentlessly on students' end goals.
- 2 | Always design and decide with the student in mind.
- 3 | Pair high expectations with high support.
- 4 | Foster the use of data, inquiry, and evidence.
- 5 | Take ownership of goals and performance.
- 6 | Enable action and thoughtful innovation.
- 7 | Lead the work of partnering across systems.

**Strong Workforce Program Metrics (<http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/portals/6/docs/sw/Strong%20Workforce%20Metrics.pdf>)**

**Background** | Per the Strong Workforce Program legislation, performance accountability measures shall “to the extent possible, align with the performance accountability measures of the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (Public Law 113-128). Outcome measures shall include, to the extent possible, demographic data, to allow policymakers and the general public to evaluate progress in closing equity gaps in program access and completion, and earnings of underserved demographic groups.... Recommendations for future allocations to consortiums [should be] based upon program outcomes, including, at a minimum, the number of certificates granted to, and wage increases of, students who have completed a career technical education program.”

**Metrics** | All metrics are disaggregated by race, gender, and age grouping, and are available in the LaunchBoard.

- Number of course enrollments: The number of registrations in courses (may include duplicated students)\*\*
- Number of students who got a degree or certificate: Unique individuals who completed a credit or noncredit local certificate, credit or noncredit Chancellor’s Office approved certificate, associate degree, or applied bachelor’s degree \*
- Number of students who transferred: Unique individuals who transferred to a four-year institution
- Employed in the second fiscal quarter after exit: Employment rate for exiting students in the second fiscal quarter after leaving the community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)\*
- Employed in the fourth fiscal quarter after exit: Employment rate for exiting students in the fourth fiscal quarter after leaving the community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)\*
- Job closely related to field of study: The proportion of students who reported that their current job is close or very close to their field of study (based on responses in the CTE Outcomes Survey)

- Median earnings in the second fiscal quarter after exit: Earnings for exiting students in the second fiscal quarters after leaving the community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)\*
  - Median change in earnings: Percentage change in earnings for exiting students, one year before and one year after exiting the California community college system (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file)\*\*
  - Attained a living wage: Proportion of exiting completing and skills-builder students who attained the living wage for a single individual in the college's Doing What Matters region (based on a match to the state unemployment insurance wage file and Insight Center for Community Economic Development data)
- 

\* WIOA metrics, \*\* additional metrics flagged in the legislation

### **Other Considerations**

- This is a working document, which means not all data is filled in and that these measure are not set in stone and are open for discussion.
- Do the measures align with the objectives?
- Is it possible to track the proposed measure?
- Are the targets realistic (i.e., are they set too high)?
- Because of the kind and amount of data we have historically, the targets may be set using different methodology.