

## Evaluation of LAMC’s Performance on the Institution-Set Standards (ISS) 2022-2023

Federal/ACCJC guidelines created the need for colleges to establish institution-set standards (ISSs) and “stretch goals” related to student achievement and to evaluate performance against them. A “standard” is the *minimum* level of performance the institution considers acceptable to meet its expectations for educational quality and institutional effectiveness. A standard differs from a performance “goal” for improvement, which an institution aspires to achieve.

LAMC has set standards, and in some cases “stretch goals,” for several measures of student retention and achievement. Every year, members of the LAMC Academic Senate meet with the LAMC Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and using disaggregated LAMC trend data and other comparative data (now available on the College’s data dashboards and from other publicly-available sources), they evaluate the College’s performance in relation to the ISSs and stretch goals and make recommendations for improvement. They may also make recommendations to change the College’s ISS’s and/or stretch goals as they deem appropriate. A summary of that discussion, which took place on May 28, 2024, is below.

### I. Successful Course Completion

The successful course completion rate is the number of students who receive passing grades (A, B, C, or P) divided by the number of students enrolled at census.

	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	64%	64%	64%
<b>Stretch Goal</b>	67%	67%	67%
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>67.5%</b>	<b>65.8%</b>	<b>66.9%</b>

- **Keep ISS and Stretch Goal**
- As also seen in previous years, first-time students had the lowest success rates compared to students of all other enrollment statuses.
  - It was noted that AB 1705 will put new STEM students in a Calculus class as their first math class, which could further bring down the successful course completion rate of new students.
  - **Recommendation to ensure new students are aware of the importance of having a balanced schedule that is not too overwhelming.**
  - **Recommendation to ensure new students are aware of the “EW” (Excused Withdrawal) grade option.**

- There were also persistent gaps for Black and Hispanic students in successful course completion.
  - **We have new programs at the college (e.g., Puente, Black Scholars) and it will be important to evaluate the success of these programs, and other interventions, and to continue to promote them to new students.**

The course retention rate is the number of students who remain in the course after the no-penalty drop date (i.e., did not drop the course) divided by the number of students who were enrolled in the course at census. *This metric is not required to be reported in the ACCJC Annual Report.*

	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	85%	85%	
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>85.3%</b>	<b>86.3%</b>	

- **Keep ISS** (there is no Stretch Goal for this metric)
- The disaggregated student data shows that retention rates are near/at the ISS for most student populations (e.g., across different ages, genders, ethnicities, entering student statuses, and student unit loads). However, students receiving the CA Promise Grant (fee waiver) had lower course retention than the standard, and students receiving a Pell Grant had especially high course retention.
  - **Recommendation to ensure students are aware of the benefits of a Pell Grant and encourage them to apply (the majority of students will qualify), and encourage students to enroll in 15 units, when feasible, as it comes with additional aid.**
- It was noted that course retention rates in online classes had been lower than the ISS prior to the pandemic, but starting in Fall 2020 (and onwards) they have been above the ISS.
  - Several theories were proposed for this – for example, students becoming more adept at taking online classes, faculty becoming more adept at teaching online classes, or possibly online classes becoming less rigorous when the pandemic hit because everything was suddenly forced to go online/remote.
    - **There was a recommendation for more professional development regarding ensuring rigor in online classes.**

The proportion of students (excluding concurrently enrolled high school students) retained from fall to spring at the same college, excluding students who completed an award or transferred to a postsecondary institution. *This metric is not required to be reported in the ACCJC Annual Report.*

In order to be in alignment with Strategic Goal #2 of the 2019-2024 LAMC Integrated Strategic Master Plan (ISMP), the persistence data provided below tracks progress on ISMP Performance Measure 2.7.2, “increase fall-to-spring student persistence to State-level of performance.”

	Fall 2019 to Spring 2020	Fall 2020 to Spring 2021	
LAMC	55.5%	53.9%	
LACCD	62.1%	64.4%	60.3%
California	66.6%	67.4%	

- According to the data in the CCCCO’s Student Success Metrics dashboard, we have been consistently declining in student persistence rates; however, when we look at the data in our own LAMC dashboard, we see that the rates look much better (and do not show the same consistent decline) when we take out students attending LAMC who do not have their majors declared at LAMC (i.e., their majors are declared at one of the other LACCD colleges).
  - **Recommendation to use the college’s own data (so that non-LAMC majors can be excluded) when looking at fall-to-spring persistence rates for planning purposes.**
- It was noted that the College’s Retention/Persistence Task Force (established in the Quality Focus Essay of our accreditation report) and the Guided Pathways Student Equity Committee’s Persistence workgroup have merged, and that that group is focused on addressing issues of student persistence, especially for disproportionately impacted student groups.
  - An area of focus for this group has been on the promotion of Financial Aid, as persistence rates are higher for students receiving CA Promise Grants and even higher for students receiving Pell Grants. Persistence is also positively correlated with students’ unit loads.
  - It was noted that Black students have consistently had lower persistence rates compared to the other races/ethnicities, and it is great that we now have such an active Black Scholar’s program to help address this gap.



Number of Associate’s Degrees awarded from July 1 through June 30 of the following year (duplicated) and/or the number of students receiving Associate’s Degrees during the same time period (unduplicated). As students may receive multiple degrees in the same year, the duplicated count exceeds the unduplicated count.

**Duplicated Degrees:**

	2020-2021	2021-2022	
Institution-Set Standard	960	960	
Actual Performance	1,555	1,385	

**Unduplicated Students Obtaining Degrees (reported to ACCJC):**

	<b>2020-2021</b>	<b>2021-2022</b>	
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	540	540	
<b>Stretch Goal</b>	793	825	
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>804</b>	<b>781</b>	

- **Keep ISSs and Stretch Goal**
- It was discussed that, despite COVID, more students attained more degrees in 2020-2021 than in any other year, which is, in part, due to the dramatic increase in the number of classes offered online/remotely that allowed some students to complete their degrees who may otherwise have not been able to.
- As expected, we are now seeing the downstream effects of lower overall enrollment (due to Covid and the ending of HEERF funding that had allowed for more classes to be offered, and in various formats) in our completion numbers; however, the number of expected graduates looks like it will be higher in 2023-24 than it was in 2022-2023.



Number of State Chancellor's Office-approved General Education (GE)-related certificates (CSU and IGETC) and number of non-GE Certificates of Achievement awarded from July 1 through June 30, and/or the unduplicated number of students receiving any of these certificates during the same time period.

**GE-Related Certificates:**

	<b>2020-2021</b>	<b>2021-2022</b>	
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	390	425	
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>563</b>	

**State-Approved Non-GE-Related Certificates:**

	<b>2020-2021</b>	<b>2021-2022</b>	
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	180	200	
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>504</b>	

**Unduplicated Students Obtaining State-Approved Certificates (reported to ACCJC):**

	<b>2020-2021</b>	<b>2021-2022</b>	
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	522	600	
<b>Stretch Goal</b>	713	800	
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>864</b>	

- **Keep ISSs and Stretch Goal**
- While the number of students attaining GE-related certificates was high during Covid and has been declining since then (like we are seeing with degrees), the number of non-GE-related certificates was low during Covid and has been much higher in the last two years.
  - There was discussion around Cal-GETC and how the requirements are closer to the IGETC than the CSU-GE requirements, so we can expect our GE-related certificate numbers to go down when this is implemented (starting in Fall 2025) because we currently award many more CSU-GE certificates than IGETC certificates (414 vs 47, respectively).
- **Recommendation for departments to establish processes and/or encourage class assignments for students to petition for certificates (this is already happening in some programs, like in Child Development and Allied Health).**
- **Recommendation to clarify the certificate petition process for high school counselors, as many of them are unclear on this or think that it happens automatically for students (which the College is striving for, but this is not 100%).**

## VI. Transfer

Number of students who transfer to a four-year college or university in the CSU and UC systems.

	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	380	380	380
<b>Stretch Goal</b>	560	560	560
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>485</b>

### Transfers to CSUs and UCs

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
CSU	340	390	453	436	450
UC	37	43	43	38	35
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>485</b>

### Transfers to CSUs by Gender and Ethnicity

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>450</b>
<b>Gender</b>					
Female	67.1%	61.8%	61.8%	64.2%	62.4%
Male	32.9%	38.2%	38.2%	35.8%	37.6%

<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Hispanic	72.1%	75.4%	76.8%	76.2%	81.3%
White	8.8%	10.5%	6.6%	6.4%	6.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.5%	1.8%	4.2%	4.1%	5.6%
Black	1.5%	2.8%	0.9%	2.1%	1.3%
Multiethnic	1.8%	0.5%	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%
Native American	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Non-US resident	5.6%	6.2%	5.7%	7.6%	1.3%
Unknown	6.5%	2.6%	4.6%	2.8%	3.8%

### Transfers to UCs by Gender and Ethnicity

	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Gender</b>					
Female	62.2%	53.5%	48.8%	51.4%	61.8%
Male	37.8%	46.5%	51.2%	48.7%	38.2%
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
Hispanic	64.9%	60.5%	60.5%	65.8%	68.6%
White	16.2%	25.6%	27.9%	18.4%	11.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	10.8%	3.0%	7.0%	10.5%	0.0%
Black	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Native American	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Unknown	8.1%	4.7%	4.7%	5.3%	20.0%

- **Keep ISS and Stretch Goal**
- **While we are meeting our ISS, and our transfers, for the most part, reflect LAMC's student population, we should consider ways to increase our number of annual transfers overall.**

### **VII. CTE Licensure Pass Rates**

The ACCJC definition for **licensure pass rate** is, in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study, "the number of students who passed the licensure examination divided by the number of students who took the examination." The ACCJC Annual Report form also specifies that rates should only be reported for programs where there were at least ten students who completed the program in the designated year.

Currently, the only program that requires a licensure pass rate is the **Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA)** program, which was launched in Spring 2016.

	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
<b>Institution-Set Standard</b>	90%	90%	90%
<b>Stretch Goal</b>	100%	100%	100%
<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>

- **Keep ISS and Stretch Goal**
- Future programs that will require this reporting include Phlebotomy (starting in 2023-2024) and LVN (starting in 2024-2025).

### VIII. CTE Job Placement Rates

The ACCJC definition for **job placement rate** is, for students completing certificate programs and career education degrees, "the number of students employed in the year following graduation divided by the number of students who completed the program."

The College uses employment rate data from the Career Technical Education (CTE) Perkins V Employment Core Indicator report (found at: [https://misweb.cccco.edu/perkinsv/Core\\_Indicator\\_Reports/Default.aspx](https://misweb.cccco.edu/perkinsv/Core_Indicator_Reports/Default.aspx)) for our job placement rates. Employment rates are reported for programs that had 10 or more students completing certificates or degrees that year in the 6-digit TOP code and that also had at least 10 students in the Perkins V cohort that year (otherwise "\*\*\*\*" is displayed).

- **Institution-Set Standard:** Meet the State-set performance goal
- **Stretch Goal:** Increase at least 3 percentage points over the last reported job placement rate for each program *or* to be at the previous/current year's Institution-Set-Standard, whichever is higher

The State-set performance goal (and thus the institution-set standard) for the 2021-2022 cohort was **73.3%**.

#### Institution-Set Standards for Job Placement Rates

Cohort	ISS (State-set Performance Goal)
<b>2021-22</b>	<b>73.3%</b>
2020-21	73.2%
2019-20	73.0%
2018-19	73.2%
2017-18	73.2%
2016-17	69.7%
2015-16	67.5%

## Job Placement Rates by CTE Program

<b>Program</b>	<b>Stretch Goal</b>	<b>2019-20 cohort</b>	<b>2020-21 cohort</b>	<b>2021-22 cohort</b>
<b>Accounting</b> (AA; Certificate)	79.5%	***	76.5%	***
<b>Administration of Justice</b> (AS; AS-T; Skill Awards)	96.3%	74.1%	93.3%	73.1%
<b>Biotechnology and Biomedical Technology</b> (AS; Certificates)	78.0%	75.0%	***	88.9%
<b>Business Administration</b> (AA; AS-T)	76.3%	75.0%	73.3%	81.3%
<b>Child Development/Early Care and Education</b> (Child Development AA; Early Childhood Education for Transfer AS-T; Certificates; Skill Awards)	73.3%	65.2%	69.5%	74.7%
<b>Computer Infrastructure and Support</b> (Cyber Security Associate AS, Certificate, and Skill Award; Full Stack Developer AS and Certificate)	76.3%	***	***	70.0%
<b>Culinary Arts</b> (AA; Certificates; Skill Awards)	80.4%	63.8%	77.4%	75.0%
<b>Health Professions, Transfer Core Curriculum</b> (Health Science AS)	83.4%	84.1%	80.4%	87.2%
<b>Interior Design and Merchandising</b> (AA; Certificates; Skill Award)	73.3%	63.6%	***	***
<b>Office Technology/Office Computer Applications</b> (AA; Certificates; Skill Awards)	83.0%	61.5%	80.0%	66.7%
<b>Paralegal</b> (AA; Certificate)	85.6%	91.7%	82.6%	87.0%
<b>Pharmacy Technology</b> (AS; Certificates)	73.3%	81.3%	61.1%	93.8%

- **Keep ISS and Stretch Goal methodology**
- In the most recent data, the programs that fell just short of the ISS would have needed just one more student to be employed in order to have reached the ISS.
- Individual programs address job placement rate data in their biennial program reviews.
- In looking at our data in the CTE Outcomes Survey, it looks like, especially post-pandemic, LAMC students are less likely to be employed in a job closely or very closely related to their program of study than the State average.