

2014 College Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Report
Los Angeles Valley College
April 29, 2015

I. Alignment of College and District Strategic Plans

[Add text]

District Strategic Plan Goal	College Strategic Plan Goal
Goal 1: Access and Preparation for Success – <i>Improve equitable access; help students attain important early educational momentum points.</i>	
Goal 2: Teaching and Learning for Success – <i>Strengthen effective teaching and learning by providing a learner-centered educational environment; help students attain their goals of certificate and degree completion, transfer, and job training and career placement; increase equity in the achievement of these outcomes.</i>	
Goal 3: Organizational Effectiveness – <i>Improve organizational effectiveness through data-informed planning and decision-making, process assessment, and professional development.</i>	
Goal 4: Resources and Collaboration – <i>Increase and diversify sources of revenue in order to achieve and maintain fiscal stability and to support District initiatives. Enhance and maintain mutually beneficial external partnerships with business, labor, and industry and other community and civic organizations in the greater Los Angeles area.</i>	

II. Goal #1- Comparison of College to District

Goal #1- Access and Preparation for Success	2011	2012	2013	2013 District	3 year change College	3 year change District
Objective 1. Ensure equitable access to education <i>1.2 Percentage of eligible students receiving Pell Grant</i>	68%	64%	67%	71%	-1%	0%
Objective 2. Increase the percentage of new students who complete the matriculation process <i>2.1 Percentage of new students completing English assessment in the first term or before</i>	73%	70%	72%	73%	-1%	1%

2.1 Percentage of new students completing Math assessment in the first term or before	75%	70%	78%	75%	3%	1%
Objective 3. Increase the percentage of new students successfully completing at least one English and Math class in their first year and persisting to subsequent terms.						
3.1 Percentage of new students successfully completing at least one English and Math class in their first year	21%	21%	28%	19%	7%	2%
3.2 Persistence - Fall to Spring	85%	86%	87%	87%	2%	1%
3.2 Persistence - Fall to Fall	76%	76%	77%	75%	1%	1%

Goal #1- College Analysis and Response				
District Measure	Strength or Weakness	College Response	Plans for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)
Measure 1.1.2: Percentage of eligible students receiving Pell Grants				
Measure 1.2.1: Percentage of new students completing English assessment and Math assessment in the first term or before				
Measure 1.3.1: Percentage of new students successfully completing at least one English and Math class in their first year				
Measure 1.3.2: Persistence – Fall-to-Spring & Fall-to-Fall				

III. Goal #2- Comparison of College to District

Goal #2- Teaching and Learning for Success	2011	2012	2013	2013 District	3 year change College	3 year change District
Objective 1. Provide a learner-centered learning environment						
1.1 Measure of active learning/project learning			63%	63%	NA	NA
1.1 Measure of student engagement in and out of class			20%	20%	NA	NA
1.1 Measure of self-efficacy/self-directed learning			64%	67%	NA	NA
1.3 Measure of how technology is being used to improve student learning and engagement			70%	71%	NA	NA
Objective 2. Improve student outcomes*						
2.1 Percentage of new student cohort completing 30 units in 3 years	58%	61%	63%	62%	5%	4%
2.1 Percentage of new student cohort completing 60 units in 3 years	27%	30%	32%	29%	5%	2%
2.2 Percentage of new student cohort successfully completing English 101 and Math 125 (or above) in 3 years	27%	28%	30%	26%	4%	3%
2.2 Percentage of new student cohort successfully completing English 101 and Math 125 (or above) in 6 years	36%	36%	38%	33%	2%	2%
2.3 Completion rate (i.e., certificate, degree or transfer) in 3 years	14%	15%	13%	13%	-1%	-2%
2.3 Completion rate (i.e., certificate, degree or transfer) in 6 years	39%	36%	35%	33%	-3%	-3%

*Year for Objective 2 metrics denotes the final year of the measurement period for each cohort. For example, 2013 is final year for the three year measurement period beginning in 2010.

Goal #2- College Analysis and Response				
District Measure	Strength or Weakness	College Response	Plans for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)
Measure 2.1.1: Active /project learning				
Measure 2.1.1: Student engagement in and out of class				
Measure 2.1.1: Self-efficacy/self-directed learning				

Measure 2.1.3: <i>Technology is being used to improve student learning and engagement</i>				
Measure 2.2.1 <i>Percentage of new student cohort completing 30 units and completing 60 units in 3 years</i>				
Measure 2.2.2 <i>Percentage of new student cohort successfully completing English 101 and Math 125 (or above) in 3 years and in 6 years</i>				
Measure 2.2.3 <i>Completion rate (i.e., certificate, degree, or transfer) in 3 years and in 6 years</i>				

IV. Institutional Efficiency- Comparison of College to District

Institutional Efficiency	2011	2012	2013	2013 District	3 year change College	3 year change District
Average Class Size in Credit Classes	39.6	37.8	36.4	37.7	-8%	-8%
Cost/FTES (annual)	\$4,239	\$4,229	\$4,141	\$4,314	-2%	7%

Institutional Efficiency- College Analysis and Response				
District Measure	Strength or Weakness	College Response	Plans for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)

<i>Average class size in credit classes</i>				
<i>Cost/FTES (annual)</i>				