

# INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT CARD

DECEMBER 2008

Published by the LeeCollege  
Institutional Effectiveness  
Committee

## Preface

Lee College, with its annual Institutional Effectiveness Report Card (IERC), sustains its strong commitment to institutional effectiveness. This year's review, embodied in this document, includes indicators derived from the College's goals for 2006-2007. The measures shown are designed to reflect how well the College is accomplishing its goals, which in turn, support Lee College's mission.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), as part of its annual preparations for publishing this year's IERC, reviewed last year's indicators and made some additions, modifications, and deletions. These changes were generally made to add indicators that the committee believed were more relevant to the College goals and to take advantage of additional data that has become available since last year's report. All measures chosen reflect the consensus of the IEC. A comparison of the core indicators of effectiveness published by the American Association of Community Colleges on May 17, 1994 shows that this IERC provides all but two of the indicators recommended:

<b>AACC Core Indicator</b>	<b>Lee College Indicator Number(s)</b>
Student Goal Attainment	Indicator 2.3b
Persistence (Fall to Fall)	Indicator 1.2
Degree Completion Rate	Indicator 2.3a
Placement Rate in the Work Force	Indicator 6.1
Employer Assessment of Students	None. Unable to obtain data after 1995-96.
Number and Rate Who Transfer	Indicator 5.5
Performance After Transfer	Indicator 1.4
Success in Subsequent, Related Coursework	Indicator 2.4, 2.5, 2.6
Demonstration of Critical Literacy Skills	None. Data unavailable from TX Higher Ed. Coordinating Board
Demonstration of Citizenship Skills	Indicator 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6
Client Assessment of Programs and Services	Indicators 3.2a, 3.2b, 3.3, and 1.5
Responsiveness to Community Needs	Indicators 6.2a, 6.2b, 6.2c, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 5.3, 5.5, 10.4, and 10.5
Participation Rate in the Service Area	Indicators 6.2c, 8.1, 10.1 thru 10.6

As with previous IERC's, this document is organized by goal with institution-wide indicators shown for each goal. Every effort was made to use the most recent data available. The IEC developed the recommended working targets for the indicators after reviewing existing historical data, discussing what the desirable targets should be, and reaching group consensus. Newer indicators may have no working target yet established.

The IERC is designed to foster discussion among all the College's diverse elements with a view towards continuous improvement in the accomplishment of the College mission.

## **The Lee College Institutional Effectiveness Committee:**

Dennis Topper (Chair)

Ricky Vaughan (ex officio)

Donna Zuniga (Past Chair)

Felicia Thomas (CAO Non-teaching)

Pam McManus (Faculty)

Jimmy Lockett (Faculty)

Bonnie Baillio (Staff Assembly)

Sharon Mullins (Any div.-non-teaching)

Mike Sparkes (Administrators Assembly)

De De Griffith (Faculty)

Paul Allen (Faculty)

Stewart Edwards (Faculty)

Paul Johnson (Faculty)

Clare Fleming (CAO -Non-teaching)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface .....	i
Lee College Institutional Effectiveness Committee.....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
Introduction .....	1
How to Use this Report Card .....	2
Summary of Goals and Results 2005-2006 .....	3
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 1.....	6
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 2 .....	13
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 3 .....	24
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 4 .....	34
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 5 .....	42
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 6 .....	48
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 7 .....	55
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 8 .....	62
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 9 .....	66
Indicators of Effectiveness - Goal 10 .....	71

# Introduction

A major aspect of Institutional Effectiveness is *evaluation* of an institution's performance. For this reason, the Lee College Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) has selected a number of key indicators designed to reflect the progress that Lee College is making with respect to accomplishment of its goals. Thus, included in this IERC are measures for each of the College's goals for the 2006-2007 year. For ease of use, the IERC is organized by goal with relevant indicators following each goal. Some indicators are more accurate measures than others. For instance, financial indicators, such as cost per full time equivalent student (FTE), are precise. Others are less so, but serve as acceptable proxies for the desired information. Generally, the IEC chose indicators that are well understood, widely accepted, and easy to compute using available data.

The IEC recognizes that to assess performance, it is often helpful to compare Lee College with other institutions. Accordingly, wherever possible, the IEC collected such comparative data.

The IEC wants to emphasize that there is no "right" or "wrong" value for any indicator. What is essential is to know Lee College's position relative to peers, to past performance, and, most importantly, to accomplishment of its goals and then to investigate and understand the reasons for any perceived problem areas. Once these reasons are understood, the IERC can become the basis for taking or not taking action.

It is also important to bear in mind the external trends and influences not directly reflected in the indicators presented. For example, as a public institution, Lee College must monitor Texas political and economic trends that will affect appropriations. In addition, as a community college, Lee College must monitor local business trends for clues about needed new programs.

Caveats notwithstanding, the IERC provides a framework for understanding Lee College's institutional condition relative to its goals and for taking steps to improve.

## **How to Use This Institutional Effectiveness Report Card (IERC)**

Step 1. Recognize that the IERC is but one part of a comprehensive, continuous, institutional effectiveness process.

Step 2. Review the College goals. Each section contains a page with a goal statement containing a summary of the College's progress towards accomplishing that goal.

Step 3. Review the institutional effectiveness indicators for each goal. The indicators contain the data used for a particular measure, the source(s) for the data, the working target(s), and a designated Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for the indicator.

Step 4. After your review of the IERC, meet with others in your functional area and discuss how you will use the results of the IERC's evaluation. Are there any adjustments that *you* believe may be needed to better meet the College's goals? *This is your big chance to influence how the College accomplishes its mission!*

Step 5. In coordination within your organization, modify your unit plan to incorporate the adjustments of Step 4. For example, an indicator may lead you to recommend accomplishing research to uncover the reasons behind performance. Or, your action plan might conceivably become part of a budget proposal to obtain the resources needed for goal attainment.

Step 6. Over the course of time, monitor your unit's performance via the annual IERC to see if the adjustment you made actually moved the College closer to goal accomplishment. What were the results of your initiatives?

Step 7. Go back to Step 1 and start the cycle over again. Adjustments would be made and the process of continuous improvement sustained.

*Functional areas do not have to address each and every indicator simultaneously. Due to limited resources, such an approach is clearly not economically feasible. Accordingly, an organization may choose to focus its attention on one particular issue and over the course of time research and implement a specific action plan for just that item. The idea is to use the IERC as one means to evaluate goal achievement and, then, as a framework for continuous improvement.*

## **Summary of Goals 2006-2007**

**GOAL 1.** We will identify, develop, and implement measures of academic excellence and institutional effectiveness and evaluate the progress of the institution's achievement of its goals and strategic objectives.

<i>Indicator 1.1</i>	<i>Licensure Examination Pass Rates</i>
<i>Indicator 1.2b</i>	<i>Fall to Fall Retention Rate - Achieving the Dream Cohort</i>
<i>Indicator 1.2a</i>	<i>Fall to Fall Retention Rate</i>
<i>Indicator 1.3</i>	<i>Semester Course Withdrawal Rate</i>
<i>Indicator 1.4</i>	<i>Average GPA of UHCL Students Who Have Transferred From Lee College</i>
<i>Indicator 1.5</i>	<i>Student Evaluation of Quality of Lee College Education</i>
<i>Indicator 1.6</i>	<i>Performance of Students Receiving Scholarships</i>

**GOAL 2.** We will review proposed instructional programs, continue evaluating and revitalizing existing curricula and instructional technologies, and provide for lifelong learning and avocational

<i>Indicator 2.1</i>	<i>Student Course Completion Rate</i>
<i>Indicator 2.2</i>	<i>Student Grade Point Average Performance</i>
<i>Indicator 2.3a</i>	<i>Percent of Students Who Complete Programs with a Degree or Certificate</i>
<i>Indicator 2.3b</i>	<i>Percent of Students Who Complete Programs with a Degree or Certificate - Achieving the Cohort</i>
<i>Indicator 2.3c</i>	<i>Lee College Student Goals Versus Actual Achievements</i>
<i>Indicator 2.4</i>	<i>Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) - GPA Achieved after DE</i>
<i>Indicator 2.5</i>	<i>Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) - Percent of Students Passing Follow On Freshman English Courses after DE</i>
<i>Indicator 2.6</i>	<i>Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) - Percent of Student Passing Follow On Freshman Math Courses after DE</i>
<i>Indicator 2.7</i>	<i>Continuing Education (CE) Activity Participants</i>
<i>Indicator 2.8a</i>	<i>New Credit Course Offerings</i>
<i>Indicator 2.8b</i>	<i>New Continuing Education Course Offerings</i>

**GOAL 3.** We will improve the recruitment, retention, and achievement of all students.

<i>Indicator 3.1</i>	<i>Percent of Minority and Women Students Enrolled at Lee College Compared to Percent of Minority and Women High School Graduates in the Baytown Service Area</i>
<i>Indicator 3.2a</i>	<i>Student Evaluation of the Lee College Services - Spring 2005 (All Students)</i>
<i>Indicator 3.2b</i>	<i>Student Evaluation of the Lee College Services - Spring 2005 (Minority Breakout)</i>
<i>Indicator 3.3</i>	<i>Student Evaluation of Attending Lee College - Spring 2005</i>
<i>Indicator 3.4</i>	<i>Minority Retention Rate</i>
<i>Indicator 3.5</i>	<i>Retention Rate by Gender</i>
<i>Indicator 3.6</i>	<i>Tuition and Fees in Comparison to Other Gulf Coast Consortium Community Colleges</i>
<i>Indicator 3.7</i>	<i>Percentages of Students Receiving Financial Assistance (Break Out By Assistance Type)</i>

*Indicator 3.8*

*Cohort Default Rates in Comparison to other Gulf Coast Consortium CC*

*Dream*

**GOAL 4.** We will maintain our commitment to educational excellence through intensive efforts to recruit and retain outstanding personnel.

- Indicator 4.1*      *Ratio of Credit Classes Taught by Full-Time Instructors to Those Taught by Part-Time Instructors*
- Indicator 4.2*      *Salary Comparisons - Full-Time Faculty*
- Indicator 4.3*      *Salary Comparisons - Full Time Exempt Non Faculty Employees*
- Indicator 4.4*      *Salary Comparisons - Full Time Non Exempt Non Faculty*
- Indicator 4.5*      *Full Time Employee Retention Rate*
- Indicator 4.6*      *Salary Comparison - Part Time Faculty*

**GOAL 5.** We will improve the College's linkages with business, industry, and other educational institutions, including high schools, colleges, and universities, to facilitate movement into the job market, within the job market, and/or transfers to this and other institutions.

- Indicator 5.1*      *GED Training Program Success Rate*
- Indicator 5.2*      *High School Graduate Migration Rate for Baytown Campus*
- Indicator 5.3*      *Number of Students in Tech Prep Programs - Break-out by*
- Indicator 5.4*      *Number of Cooperation and Collaboration Initiatives*
- Indicator 5.5*      *Lee College, Baytown Migration Rates in Comparison to Gulf Coast Consortium Community College*

**GOAL 6.** We will continue expanding the College's commitment to the economic development of the region by expanding training partnerships with business and industry and by providing opportunities for workers to upgrade their skills.

- Indicator 6.1*      *Lee College Students Employed in Their Field One Year after Completing Technical/Vocational Programs Compared to the State Average*
- Indicator 6.2a*      *Applied Science Industry Contact Hours*
- Indicator 6.2b*      *Community Education Contact Hours*
- Indicator 6.2c*      *Number of Small Business Development Center (SBDC) Contacts*
- Indicator 6.3*      *Applied Science and Community Education Advisory Committee Meetings*
- Indicator 6.4*      *Applied Science and Community Education Program Reviews*

**GOAL 7.** We will maintain a safe and inviting physical environment.

- Indicator 7.1*      *Annual Campus Security Report*
- Indicator 7.2*      *Safety Inspection Item Completion Rate*
- Indicator 7.3*      *Number of Infrastructure Upgrade Projects Completed*
- Indicator 7.4*      *Preventive Maintenance Program Success*
- Indicator 7.5*      *Student Evaluation of Physical Environment - Spring 2005*
- Indicator 7.6*      *Number of Accidents Reported*

**GOAL 8.** We will provide a cost-effective utilization of human, physical, fiscal, and technological resources.

*Indicator 8.1*      *Cost per Full Time Equivalent Student*

*Indicator 8.2a*    *Headcount*

*Indicator 8.2b*    *Contact Hours*

*Indicator 8.3*      *Budget Percentages*

**GOAL 9.** We will enhance students' knowledge of other cultures and their understanding of global issues by promoting an international perspective, awareness, and understanding.

*Indicator 9.1*      *Internationalize the Curriculum*

*Indicator 9.2*      *Faculty Development*

*Indicator 9.3*      *Special Projects*

*Indicator 9.4*      *Community Partnerships*

**GOAL 10.** We will support community service through a variety of activities.

*Indicator 10.1*    *Facility Rental*

*Indicator 10.2*    *Operating Budget Commitment to Community Service*

*Indicator 10.3*    *Scholarship Funds Committed to Senior Citizen Programs*

*Indicator 10.4*    *Community Service Activities*

*Indicator 10.5*    *Participation in HEAC and BEAC*

*Indicator 10.6*    *Participation in Student Activities*

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 1

**GOAL 1.** *We will identify, develop, and implement measures of academic excellence and institutional effectiveness, and evaluate the progress of the institution's achievement of its goals and strategic objectives.*

- Indicator 1.1      Licensure Examination Pass Rates*
- Indicator 1.2a    Fall to Fall Retention Rate*
- Indicator 1.2b    Fall to Fall Retention Rate - Achieving the Dream Cohort*
- Indicator 1.3      Semester Course Withdrawal Rate*
- Indicator 1.4      Average GPA of UHCL Students Who Have Transferred From Lee College*
- Indicator 1.5      Student Evaluation of Quality of Lee College Education - Spring 2005*
- Indicator 1.6      Performance of Students Receiving Scholarships*

**Summary of Indicators:**

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially Met	Target Not Met	Not Evaluated
1.1		X		
1.2a			X	
1.2b				X
1.3			X	
1.4	X			
1.5	X			

**Conclusions:**

Goal is being met.



***Indicator 1.1 - Licensure Examination Pass Rates***

2005 Class	% Passing	3-Year State Average	Comments
LVN	92%	88%	met state standards
Nursing	91%	87%	met state standards
Cosmetology	n/a	n/a	n/a
Emergency Medical Tech	46%	60%	did not meet state standards

Comments:

1. Target was partially met.

---

Source: THECB 2006 Statewide Annual Licensure Report

---

Recommended Working Target: **EITHER:** 90% of students taking licensure examinations will pass. **OR:** The percentage of students taking licensure exams and pass is no more than 5% below the state average for the last 3 years for the specific licensure exam.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

**Indicator 1.2a - Fall to Fall Retention Rate**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Lee College 2004-05</b>	<b>Lee College 2003-04</b>	<b>Lee College 2002-03</b>
Remained at Lee College	35%	41%	42%

<b>Category</b>	<b>State Public Jr. Colleges 2004-05</b>	<b>Regional Public Jr. Colleges 2004-05</b>	<b>State Public Jr. Colleges 2003-04</b>	<b>Regional Public Jr. Colleges 2003-04</b>	<b>State Public Jr. Colleges 2002-03</b>	<b>Regional Public Jr. Colleges 2002-03</b>
Remained at Same College	41%	41%	44%	40%	40%	38%

Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. All rates shown are fall to fall percentages for the years indicated.

---

Source: THECB - Student Migration Report, Fall 2004 to Fall 2005

---

Recommended Working Target: Lee College will maintain a fall to fall retention rate at least equal to the State average.

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

***Indicator 1.2b - Fall to Fall Retention Rate - Achieving the Dream Cohort***

<b>Category</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>3 Year Total</b>
Remained at Lee College	41%	45%	43%	43%

Comments:

1. This is a new indicator showing retention rates for the AtD cohort. No target is yet established.

---

Source: THECB - Student Migration Report, Fall 2004 to Fall 2005

---

Recommended Working Target:

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

**Indicator 1.3 - Semester Course Withdrawal Rate**

<b>Semester</b>	<b>Course Withdrawal Rate</b>
Fall 2001	19%
Spring 2002	21%
Fall 2002	20%
Spring 2003	23%
Fall 2003	21%
Spring 2004	23%
Fall 2004	20%
Spring 2005	21%
Fall 2005	22%
Spring 2006	23%
Fall 2006	22%
Spring 2007	24%

Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. The above data includes all locations except HCLC.
3. The above data excludes all developmental courses.

---

Source: Lee College Office of Institutional Research Grade Distribution Reports,  
Fall 2006 and Spring 2007

---

Recommended Working Target: Lee College will strive for a withdrawal rate of 20% or less.

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

***Indicator 1.4 - Average GPA of UHCL Students Who Have Transferred From Lee College***

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Total Students</b>	<b>Average GPA</b>
Alvin Community College	321	3.103
Brazosport Community College	130	3.096
College of the Mainland	329	3.026
Galveston Community College	84	2.808
Houston Community College	232	3.006
<b>Lee College</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>3.284</b>
North Harris-Montgomery	53	3.129
San Jacinto College - Central	1,028	3.126
San Jacinto College - North	122	3.113
San Jacinto College - South	524	3.148
Wharton County	40	3.292
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,094</b>	<b>3.111</b>

1. Target was met.
2. The indicator is a measure of the effectiveness of Lee College transfer courses. The fact that the recommended working target is being exceeded is a positive indicator for the College.

---

Source: University of Houston Clear Lake, "Community College GPA Report"  
Fall 2007

---

Recommended Working Target: Lee College transfers will have a GPA average that equals or exceeds 3.0.

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

**Indicator 1.5 - Performance of Students Receiving Scholarships**

CATEGORY	Fall 2007		Spring 2008	
	NUMBER	MEAN GPA	NUMBER	MEAN GPA
LC Academic	1	4.00	2	1.83
LC Art	4	2.92	5	3.47
Basketball	10	2.98	12	2.71
Early High School Graduates	29	2.30	25	2.08
LC Instrumental (Music)	12	2.82	11	3.32
LC Foundation	324	2.99	299	2.88
LC General Scholarship	13	2.47	11	2.83
LC Piano (Music)	17	3.05	17	3.09
Regents Honors	1	4.00	1	3.33
LC Tennis	8	2.76	7	3.34
LC Theatre Arts	11	2.61	11	2.44
LC Vocal (Music)	16	2.96	15	2.59
LC Vocational Business Technology	9	3.04	10	2.85
LC Vocational Computer Technology	6	2.94	6	2.72
LC Vocational Technical Studies	5	3.80	6	3.76
LC Volleyball	9	2.89	8	2.64
Additional External	579	2.48	564	2.43
Group Total	1054	2.68	1010	2.61

Comments:

Target was met.

---

Source: "Performance of Students Receiving Scholarships for Lee Campus Only - Fall 2006 and Spring 2007"

---

Recommended Working Target: Total average GPA for scholarship recipients will remain 2.5 or higher.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 2

**GOAL 2.** *We will review proposed instructional programs, continue evaluating and revitalizing existing curricula and instructional technologies, and provide for lifelong learning and avocational interests.*

- Indicator 2.1 Student Course Completion Rate*
- Indicator 2.2 Student Grade Point Average Performance*
- Indicator 2.3a Percent of Students Who Complete Programs with a Degree or Certificate*
- Indicator 2.3b Percent of Students Who Complete Programs with a Degree or Certificate - Achieving the Dream Cohort*
- Indicator 2.3c Lee College Student Goals Versus Actual Achievements*
- Indicator 2.4 Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) – GPA Achieved after DE*
- Indicator 2.5 Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) - Percent of Students Passing Follow On Freshman English Courses after DE*
- Indicator 2.6 Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) – Percent of Students Passing Follow On Freshman Math Courses after DE*
- Indicator 2.7 Continuing Education (CE) Activity Participants*
- Indicator 2.8a New Credit Course Offerings*
- Indicator 2.8b New Continuing Education Course Offerings*

**Summary of Indicators:**

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially Met	Target Not Met	No Established Target
2.1	X			
2.2	X			
2.3a	X			
2.3b				X
2.3c	X			
2.4		X		
2.5		X		
2.6		X		
2.7		X		
2.8a	X			
2.8b	X			

**Conclusion:**

Goal is being met.

***Indicator 2.1 - Student Course Completion Rate***

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Student Completion Rates	75%	78%	76%	77%	78%	76%	76%

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Percentages are of students who received a grade of A-F in courses based on enrollment as of the twelfth class day.
3. Data includes only Fall and Spring students at the Baytown campus.

---

Source: Student Grade Report

---

Recommended Working Target: At least 70% of all Lee College Students will complete courses.

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer  
 Dean of Student Services for Development and Success

---

INDC 2.2

**Indicator 2.2 - Student Grade Point Average Performance  
(Break Out Minority Variable)**

	FALL 2002	FALL 2003	FALL 2004	FALL 2005	FALL 2006	FALL 2007
All Students						
Satisfactory GPA Rates	77.1%	76.6%	74.6%	69.0%	69.0%	69.8%
Black Students						
Satisfactory GPA Rates	70.2%	75.3%	73.0%	60.8%	63.8%	68.9%
Hispanic Students						
Satisfactory GPA Rates	74.3%	74.7%	74.7%	69.2%	65.8%	66.3%
Asian & American Indian Students						
Satisfactory GPA Rates	76.5%	70.1%	81.5%	73.0%	77.1%	75.2%

Comments:

Target was met.

---



---

Source: Student Grade Report, CBM 001 Report

Recommended Working Target: Monitor trends each year. At least 65 percent of Lee College students will maintain a GPA of 2.0 or better.

---



---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---



---

***Indicator 2.3a - Percent of Students Who Complete Programs with a Degree or Certificate (Break Out Minority Variable)***

	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Number of Students Receiving Degrees or Certificates	1094	1121	1219	984	1116
All Students (% of Total Number of Students Enrolled)	17.1%	17.7%	20.6%	20.8%	20.9%
Minorities Receiving Degrees or Certificates	548	564	604	508	630
Minorities Receiving Degrees or Certificates (% of Total Awarded)	50.1%	50.3%	49.5%	51.6%	56.5%

Comments:

Target was met.

---

Source: Lee College Office of Institutional Research Graduate Analysis Report

---

Recommended Working Target: The number of students who complete either a degree or certificate will increase annually based on total students enrolled.

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success  
Chief Academic Officer

---

***Indicator 2.3b - Percent of Students Who Complete with a Degree or Certificate - Achieving the Dream Cohort (Break Out Minority Variable)***

	Cohort		Total
	03-04	04-05	
Number of Students Receiving Degrees or Certificates	75	113	188
% of Cohort	6.0%	9.1%	7.3%
Minorities Receiving Degrees or Certificates	37	59	96
% of Minority Cohort	6.7%	11.1%	8.9%

Comments:

This is a new indicator. No target has yet been set.

---



---

Source: Lee College Office of Institutional Research Graduate Analysis Report

---



---

Recommended Working Target:

---



---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---



---

**Indicator 2.3c - Lee College Student Goals Versus Actual Achievements  
(Break Out Minority Variable)**

2006-07	Goal Is	Obtained	Percent	Goal is	Obtained	Percent	Goal Is	Transferred	Percent
	Certificate	Certificate		Degree	Degree		Transfer	to Senior Institution	
White	836	345	41%	1,575	297	19%	393	184	47%
Black	277	155	56%	623	112	18%	80	55	69%
Hispanic	439	184	42%	790	136	17%	137	50	36%
Other	30	12	40%	149	31	21%	32	12	38%
All Students	1,582	696	44%	3,137	576	18%	642	301	47%

Comments:

Target was met.

---

Source: CBM001, CBM009, Student Migration Report

---

Recommended Working Target: 40% of students who declare as a goal obtaining a certificate will achieve that goal. 15% of students who declare as a goal earning a degree will achieve that goal. 30% of students who declare as a goal transfer to a senior institution as a goal will achieve that goal.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success  
Chief Academic Officer

---

***Indicator 2.4 - Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) - GPA Achieved after DE***

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
<b><i>Baytown Campus</i></b>	
Math DE Completers GPA	2.1
All Math Students GPA	2.4
Math Delta	0.3
English & Reading Completers GPA	1.8
All English Students GPA	2.2
English Delta	0.4
<b><i>Huntsville Campus</i></b>	
Math DE Completers GPA	1.8
All Math Students GPA	2.1
Math Delta	0.3
English & Reading Completers GPA	2.5
All English Students GPA	2.6
English Delta	0.1

Comments:

1. Target was partially met.
2. Although the State no longer tracks the success of developmental education in this way, the GPA's of students, who have completed DE, in comparison to all other students is one measure of DE effectiveness.
3. GPA values represent all ENGL, MATH, and READ students.

---



---

Source: Lee College Office of Institutional Research

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Either GPA's for completers will be within .3 of the GPA for all students or the GPA for DE completers will exceed 3.0.

---



---



---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---



---

***Indicator 2.5 - Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) - Percent of Students Passing Follow on Freshman English Course after DE***

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
<b><i>Baytown Campus</i></b>	
ENGL 1301 Read/Write DE Completers Pass Rate	53.7%
All ENGL 1301 Students' Pass Rate	57.3%
Delta	3.6%
<b><i>Huntsville Campus</i></b>	
ENGL 1301 Read/Write DE Completers Pass Rate	92.3%
All ENGL 1301 Students' Pass Rate	83.8%
Delta	-8.5%

Comments:

1. Target was partially met
  
2. Although the state no longer tracks the success of developmental education this way, the percent of students, who pass their follow on freshman English course (ENGL1301), is still an excellent measure of LC's DE effectiveness.
  
3. Grades of "A" through "D" are considered passing.

---

Sources: Lee College Institutional Research

---

Recommended Working Target: Either percent of DE students passing English will be within 3% or exceed the all students English pass rate or the DE completers pass rate will equal or exceed 90%

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

***Indicator 2.6 - Effectiveness of Developmental Education (DE) - Percent of Students Passing Follow on Freshman Math Courses after DE***

<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
<b><i>Baytown Campus</i></b>	
MATH 1332 and 1414 DE Completers Pass Rate	50.8%
All Math Students MATH 1332 and 1414 Pass Rate	55.6%
Delta	4.8%
<b><i>Huntsville Campus</i></b>	
MATH 1332 and 1414 DE Completers Pass Rate	80.0%
All Math Students MATH 1332 and 1414 Pass Rate	82.3%
Delta	2.3%

Comments:

1. Recommended Target was partially met.
2. Although the State no longer tracks the success of developmental education in this way, the percent of students, who pass their follow on freshman math courses (MATH 1332 or MATH 1414), is still an excellent measure of LC's DE effectiveness.
3. Grades of "A" through "D" are considered passing.

---

Sources: Lee College Institutional Research

---

Recommended Working Target: Either the DE completer math pass rate will be within 3% or exceed the all students math pass rate or the DE completer pass rate will equal or exceed 90%

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

**Indicator 2.7 - Continuing Education (CE) Activity Participants**

	Acad Year 2002-03	Acad Year 2003-04	Acad Year 2004-05	Acad Year 2005-06	Acad Year 2006-07
CE Revenues - Tuition/Funding	\$1,491,013	\$1,206,208	\$1,530,029.00	\$1,161,759.00	\$1,319,888.00
CE Headcount Enrollment	8,723	10,050	9,830	8,223	7,091
CE Contact Hours for Funding	116,586	116,180	133,847	130,780	190,721

Comments:

Target was partially met.

---



---

Source: Continuing Education Director

---



---



---



---

Recommended Working Target: Increase each year CE revenue, head count, enrollment and contact hours for funding.

---



---



---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

## Indicator 2.8A - New Credit Course Offerings

2006-07

### 1. Associate of Arts in Drama – Technical Theatre

#### Comments:

1. Target was met.

---

---

Source: Dean Hodgkin

---

---

---

---

Recommended Working Target: Functional areas will review this indicator annually.

---

---

---

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

---

**Indicator 2.8b- New Continuing Education Course Offerings**

<b>Fall 2007</b>	
<b>Funded</b>	<b>Non-Funded</b>
Patient Care Technician	Breakfast Does Not Have to be Boring
Physical Therapy Aide Program	American Regional Cuisine with Flavor
Ophthalmic Assistant Program	Knife Skills and Plating Techniques
Annual Training for Childcare Director	Vegetable Entrees
Certified Fiber to Home Technician	Thai Cuisine
Web Page Scripting for Business Applications	Making Soups
Advanced Photoshop CS2	Casseroles, Pot Pies, and Slow-Cooked Meals
Sanitation and Safety for Cosmetology Professionals	Jewelry Making Extravaganza
Targeted Development	Beijing China Senior Trip
Auto Body Repair and Repainting	
<b>ONLINE Funded</b>	<b>ONLINE Non-Funded</b>
Medical Information Management and Office Practice	Introduction to CorelDRAW X3
Creating Web Graphics with Photoshop CS3	Speed Spanish II
Introduction to Outlook 2003	
Introduction to Adobe Frame Maker 7.1	
<b>Spring 2008</b>	
<b>Funded</b>	<b>Non-Funded</b>
Cardiology	Fancy Eggs You Have Been Afraid to Try
Emergency Pharmacology	The Best Lite Dessert
Special Populations	Weight Loss Strategies
Medical Emergencies	Special Diets
EMS Operations	American Southwest Cuisine with Flavor
Assessment Based Management	Airbrush Ceramics
EMT Paramedic Clinical	
Practicum for EMT Paramedic	
Certified Fiber Optics Splicing Specialist	
Level I Basic Unarmed Security Officer	
Level II Advanced Unarmed Security Officer	
Level III Armed Security Officer	
Registrants and Ethics	
Commissioned Security Officers	
LEAN Training	
Project Management	
Supervisory Skills	
Occupational Specific Foreign Language - ESL	
Occupational Specific Foreign Language - Spanish	
Technical Writing	
<b>ONLINE Funded</b>	<b>ONLINE Non-Funded</b>
Six Sigma: Total Quality Applications	Teaching Math: Grades 4-6
Intermediate Microsoft Word	An Introduction to Teaching ESL/EFL
Business Marketing	Photoshop CS2 for Digital Photography
Real Estate	Masking Movies with Windows XP
Start Your Own Small Business	
Intermediate CSS and XHTML	
Total Quality Fundamentals	
Introduction to Database Development	
Introduction to Dreamweaver MX 2004	
Medical Coding and Billing Career Certificate - Comprehensive	
Medical Transcriptionist Career Certificate - Comprehensive	
GED on Demand with EOC	
<b>Summer 2007</b>	
<b>Funded</b>	<b>Non-Funded</b>
CPR/First Aid/Babysitting Workshop	Engineerign Camp
Interactive Digital Media Teen Camp	Jr. Firefighter One-Day Academy
Build Your Own Web Page	Introduction to Digital Photography Camp
Computer Technology Camp	Math Fundamental Camp
Physician Medical Office Administration	Goal Setting for Success Workshop
High Performance Work Teams	Jewelry Making Extravanga for Kids
Environmental Awareness	Creative Arts and Crafts Camp
Fieldbus	Art Extreme Camp
Preparation for the State Licensig Written Exam	Life (Literacy for Everyone)
	ESF for the Family
	Breakfast Blaster
	Basic Keelboat
	Using a GPS
	Readign a Nautical Chart
<b>ONLINE</b>	<b>ONLINE</b>
Real Estate Investing II: Financing	Using the Internet in the Classroom
Intermediate Dreamweaver CS3	A Writer's Guide to Descriptive Settings
Introduction to Dreamweaver CS3	Introduction to ASP.NET
Introduction to Windows Vista	Introduction to PHP and MySQL
Mastery of Business Fundamentals	Everyday Math
Manufacturing Fundamentals	
Medical Coding II	
Medical Coding and Billing Career Certificate - Accelerated	

Target was met.

Source: Continuing Education Director

Recommended Working Target: Functional areas will review this indicator annually

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 3

**GOAL 3.** *We will improve the recruitment, retention, and achievement of all students.*

- Indicator 3.1      Percent of Minority and Women Students Enrolled at Lee College  
Compared to Percent of Minority and Women High School Graduates  
in the Baytown Service Area*
- Indicator 3.2      Retention Rate by Gender*
- Indicator 3.3      Tuition and Fees in Comparison to Other Gulf Coast Consortium  
Community Colleges*
- Indicator 3.4      Percentages of Students Receiving Financial Assistance (Break Out  
By Assistance Type)*
- Indicator 3.5      Cohort Default Rates in Comparison to other Gulf Coast Consortium  
Community College*

**Summary of Indicators:**

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially	Target Not Met
3.1	X		
3.2		X	
3.3	X		
3.4	X		
3.5	X		

**Conclusion:**

Goal has been met.

**Indicator 3.1 - Percent of Minority Students Enrolled at Lee College Compared to Percent of Minority High School Graduates in the Baytown Service Area**

	Fall 2002		Fall 2003		Fall 2004		Fall 2005		Fall 2006	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total LC Students	5,234		5,321		4,857		4,560		4,795	
High School Graduates in Service Area	2,197		2,101		2,342		2,292		2,325	
LC Minority Students	2,252	43.0%	2,261	43.0%	2,144	44.0%	2,122	46.5%	2,284	47.6%
High School Minority Graduates	770	35.0%	697	33.0%	838	36.0%	890	38.8%	859	36.9%
LC Black Students	719	14.0%	776	15.0%	784	16.0%	752	16.5%	836	17.4%
High School Black Graduates	337	15.0%	305	15.0%	339	14.0%	346	15.1%	334	14.4%
LC Hispanic Students	1,111	21.0%	1,183	22.0%	1,145	24.0%	1,146	25.1%	1,252	26.1%
High School Hispanic Graduates	405	18.0%	366	17.0%	468	20.0%	513	22.4%	497	21.4%
LC Asian Pacific & Amer. Indians	68	1.0%	80	2.0%	89	2.0%	72	1.6%	75	1.6%
H.S. Asian Pac & Amer. Ind. Grads	28	1.0%	26	1.0%	31	1.0%	31	1.4%	28	1.2%

Comments:

Target was met.

---

Sources: CBM001 and Texas Education Agency

---

Recommended Working Target: The percentage of minority students attending Lee College will exceed or be within 2% of the percentage of minority high school graduates respectively from service area school districts.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---



---

Sources: CBM001 and NCES Database.

---

Recommended Working Target: The percentage of female and minority students attending Lee College will exceed or be within 2% of the percentage of female and minority high school graduates respectively from service area school districts.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

**Indicator 3.2 - Retention Rate by Gender**

1999-00	Remained at Lee College	
	Male	Female
Lee College Students	41%	42%
Texas Public Junior College Students	38%	41%

2000-01	Remained at Lee College	
	Male	Female
Lee College Students	40%	45%
Texas Public Junior College Students	39%	41%

2001-02	Remained at Lee College	
	Male	Female
Lee College Students	42%	47%
Texas Public Junior College Students	37%	39%

2002-03	Remained at Lee College	
	Male	Female
Lee College Students	39%	45%
Texas Public Junior College Students	38%	41%

2003-04	Remained at Lee College	
	Male	Female
Lee College Students	40%	43%
Texas Public Junior College Students	39%	42%

2004-05	Remained at Lee College	
	Male	Female
Lee College Students	26%	43%
Texas Public Junior College Students	39%	42%

1. Target was partially met.
2. Lee College's retention rates for each category met or exceeded the state average.
3. All rates shown are fall to fall percentages for each year.

---

Source: Lee College Office of Institutional Research, THECB Migration Report

---

Recommended Working Target: Lee College will maintain a fall to fall retention rate at least equal to the State average for a particular category.

---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer  
Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

***Indicator 3.3 - Tuition and Fees in Comparison to Other Gulf Coast Consortium Community Colleges***

COLLEGE	IN-RES			OUT-RES			NON-RES		
	6 HRS.	9 HRS.	12 HRS.	6 HRS.	9 HRS.	12 HRS.	6 HRS.	9 HRS.	12 HRS.
Alvin	\$278.00	\$393.00	\$498.00	\$446.00	\$645.00	\$834.00	\$758.00	\$1,113.00	\$1,458.00
Blinn	\$378.00	\$567.00	\$756.00	\$552.00	\$828.00	\$1,104.00	\$1,008.00	\$1,512.00	\$2,016.00
Brazosport	\$280.00	\$420.00	\$561.00	\$411.00	\$609.00	\$813.00	\$693.00	\$1,032.00	\$1,377.00
College of the Mainland	\$250.00	\$351.00	\$455.50	\$454.00	\$657.00	\$863.50	\$646.00	\$945.00	\$1,247.50
Galveston	\$324.00	\$455.00	\$581.00	\$324.00	\$455.00	\$581.00	\$504.00	\$725.00	\$941.00
Houston	\$336.00	\$504.00	\$672.00	\$660.00	\$990.00	\$1,320.00	\$780.00	\$1,170.00	\$1,560.00
<b>Lee</b>	<b>\$282.00</b>	<b>\$411.00</b>	<b>\$531.00</b>	<b>\$432.00</b>	<b>\$636.00</b>	<b>\$831.00</b>	<b>\$642.00</b>	<b>\$951.00</b>	<b>\$1,251.00</b>
NHMCC	\$288.00	\$426.00	\$564.00	\$648.00	\$966.00	\$1,284.00	\$738.00	\$1,101.00	\$1,464.00
San Jacinto	\$328.00	\$427.00	\$526.00	\$478.00	\$652.00	\$826.00	\$778.00	\$1,102.00	\$1,426.00
Wharton	\$324.00	\$486.00	\$648.00	\$600.00	\$900.00	\$1,200.00	\$792.00	\$1,188.00	\$1,584.00
Average	\$306.80	\$444.00	\$579.25	\$500.50	\$733.80	\$965.65	\$733.90	\$1,083.90	\$1,432.45

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. In the In-Resident category Lee College is lower than the average tuition and fees of the Consortium. Lee College is lower than the average in the Out-Resident category and also below the average in the Non-Resident category.
3. Tuition and fee amounts were rates during the 2008-09 academic year.

---

Source: Web sites and schedules from each institution.

---

Recommended Working Target: Indicator will be reviewed each year to review trends in tuition and fees of the College and compare them to the tuition and fees of other members of the Consortium

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

**Indicator 3.4 - Percentage of Students Receiving Financial Assistance - (Break Out by Assistance Type)**

Grant Type	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Pell/Federal	1678	19.4%	2004	24.5%	2127	36.0%	2055	30.9%	1888	25.9%
SEOG/Federal	322	3.7%	165	2.0%	325	5.5%	292	4.4%	238	3.3%
TPEG/State Grants	680	7.9%	1090	13.3%	817	13.8%	457	6.9%	692	9.5%
Institutional Scholarships	497	5.7%	594	7.3%	432	7.3%	410	6.2%	397	5.4%
Outside Organizations	336	3.9%	252	3.1%	312	5.3%	472	7.1%	867	11.9%
Total # of applicants for need-based aid	3513	40.6%	4105	50.1%	4013	67.9%	3686	55.5%	4082	55.9%

Comments:

Target was met.

---



---

Source: Financial Aid Office

---



---

Recommended Working Target: The number and percentage of students receiving financial aid will increase or be within 5% of previous years.

---



---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---



---

**Indicator 3.5 – Cohort Default Rates in Comparison to other Gulf Coast Consortium Community Colleges**

College Name	FY 2005 Cohort
Alvin	6.80
Blinn	12.30
Brazosport	9.00
College of the Mainland	0.00 (not participating in loan program)*
Galveston	4.20
Houston	6.70
Lee	2.20
NHMCC	8.40
San Jacinto	7.50
Wharton	7.30
<b>Average</b>	<b>6.44</b>

\* College of the Mainland does not participate in FFELP, but does participate in CAL loans with The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Cohort default rates are calculated every year by the US Department of Education to determine the percentages of Federal Family Education Loan and Federal Direct Loan Program borrowers who entered repayment in a federal fiscal year and defaulted in th
3. For example, the FY 2003 cohort is based on students who entered repayment in 10/01/2002-09/30/2003 and defaulted in the period of 10/01/2003-09/30/2004.
4. Schools with default rates of 20% or higher for three consecutive years may lose Title IV Financial Aid eligibility. This indicator relates to goal three because loss of federal financial aid will impact student enrollment. Also, the addition of these loan programs provides aid for middle-income students that could not attend without assistance.

---

Source: U.S. Department of Education

---

Recommended Working Target: The target is to not exceed 10% or the consortium average, whichever is less.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Financial Aid Officer

---

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 4

**GOAL 4.** *We will maintain our commitment to educational excellence through intensive efforts to recruit and retain outstanding personnel.*

- Indicator 4.1      Ratio of Credit Classes Taught by Full-Time Instructors to Those Taught by Part-Time Instructors*
- Indicator 4.2      Salary Comparisons - Full-Time Faculty*
- Indicator 4.3      Salary Comparisons - Full Time Exempt Non Faculty Employees*
- Indicator 4.4      Salary Comparisons - Full Time Non Exempt Non Faculty Employees*
- Indicator 4.5      Full Time Employee Retention Rate*
- Indicator 4.6      Salary Comparison - Part Time Faculty*

**Summary of Indicators:**

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially Met	Target Not Met
4.1	X		
4.2			X
4.3	X		
4.4	X		
4.5	X		
4.6			X

**Conclusion:**

Goal is marginally being met.

INDC 4.1

**Indicator 4.1 - Ratio of Credit Classes Taught by Full-Time Instructors to Those Taught by Part-Time Instructors**

	% of Sections Taught by FT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by FT	% of Contact Hours Taught by FT	% of Sections Taught by PT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by PT	% of Contact Hours Taught by PT
2002-03 Academic Year	69.01%	70.57%	74.50%	30.99%	29.43%	25.50%

	% of Sections Taught by FT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by FT	% of Contact Hours Taught by FT	% of Sections Taught by PT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by PT	% of Contact Hours Taught by PT
2003-04 Academic Year	68.20%	70.14%	71.74%	31.22%	29.86%	27.80%

	% of Sections Taught by FT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by FT	% of Contact Hours Taught by FT	% of Sections Taught by PT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by PT	% of Contact Hours Taught by PT
2004-05 Academic Year	62.00%	69.00%	72.00%	38.00%	31.00%	28.00%

	% of Sections Taught by FT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by FT	% of Contact Hours Taught by FT	% of Sections Taught by PT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by PT	% of Contact Hours Taught by PT
2005-06 Academic Year	74.18%	76.32%	77.63%	25.82%	23.68%	22.37%

	% of Sections Taught by FT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by FT	% of Contact Hours Taught by FT	% of Sections Taught by PT	% of Semester Credit Hours Taught by PT	% of Contact Hours Taught by PT
2006-07 Academic Year	72.19%	73.73%	75.25%	27.81%	26.27%	24.75%

**Comments:**

1. Target was partially met due primarily to hiring freeze and reduction in Full Time Faculty. Several additional FT faculty members have been hired, but their impact on this indicator will not appear until next year's report card.
2. This indicator is designed to measure the College's efforts to maintain sufficient full-time faculty to ensure quality instruction and student success.

3. Data includes terms 2070, 2072, 2073, and 2074. Administrative ZADM and VCT courses not included.

Sources: Institutional Research Office

Recommended Working Target: 75% of all classes will be taught by full-time faculty.

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

***Indicator 4.2 - Salary Comparisons - Full Time Faculty***

Lee College is currently ranked 13th in the State in the current survey of faculty surveys conducted by the Texas Community College Teachers Association.

Comments:

1. Target was not met.

---

---

Sources: Human Resource Officer, and Texas Community College Teachers Association. Salary Survey 2007.

---

---

Recommended Working Target: Lee College's faculty salary scale ranking on the annual TCCRA survey will be reviewed annually. Lee College will be in the top 10 community colleges in the State.

---

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

---

**Indicator 4.3 - Salary Comparisons - Full Time Exempt  
Non Faculty Employees**

POSITION TITLE	2006-2007 MINIMUM SALARY SCALE AMOUNT		2006-2007 MAXIMUM SALARY SCALE AMOUNT	
	Regional Median	LC	Regional Median	LC
Coordinator of Grants	\$47,436	\$47,436	\$72,917	\$84,510
Coordinator of Student Activities * (LC: Student Activities Ass't)	\$41,114	\$41,234	\$62,063	\$67,971
Director, Library Services (LC: Director of LRC)	\$48,859	\$53,322	\$77,669	\$95,229
Systems Analyst/Head Programmer (LC: Programmer/Analyst)	\$41,856	\$47,436	\$66,646	\$84,510
Director, Computer services (LC: Director of Computer/ Communications Services)	\$56,750	\$58,664	\$88,726	\$96,801
Counselor	\$41,148	\$47,436	\$68,649	\$84,510
Registrar	\$53,322	\$53,322	\$83,305	\$95,229
Director of Student Financial Aid (LC: Financial Aid Officer)	\$48,425	\$47,436	\$78,841	\$84,510
Director of Public Affairs* (LC: Director of Recruiting)	\$47,733	\$47,436	\$67,000	\$84,510
Director, Human Resources (LC: Human Resource Officer)	\$56,950	\$53,322	\$89,664	\$95,229
College Store Manager (LC: Bookstore Manager)		\$42,082		\$75,095
Director of Physical Plant	\$52,492	\$58,664	\$81,899	\$96,801
Director Small Business Dev. Center	\$46,475	\$46,475	\$74,218	\$76,491
Dean of Financial & Admin. Services (LC: Dean of Financial Services) (LC: Dean of Admin. Services)	\$67,681	\$67,368	\$101,993	\$120,567
Purchasing Agent	\$57,287	\$53,332	\$93,063	\$95,229

Comments:

1. Target
2. In cases where the job titles might
3. \*The summary of job duties differs significantly from the closest Lee College equivalent.
4. The regional medians come from Alvin Community College Salary Survey, 2006-07.

---

Source: Alvin Community College Salary Survey, 2006-07

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Each functional area will review the salaries shown.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

**Indicator 4.4 - Salary Comparisons - Full Time Non Exempt  
Non Faculty Employees**

POSITION TITLE	2006-2007 MINIMUM SALARY SCALE AMOUNT		2006-2007 MAXIMUM SALARY SCALE AMOUNT	
	Regional Median	LC	Regional Median	LC
	Groundskeeper	\$19,175	\$21,050	\$29,278
Grounds Services Supervisor (LC: Grounds/Custodial Supervisor)	\$28,358	\$41,234	\$43,318	\$67,971
Housekeeper (LC: Custodian)	\$17,248	\$17,248	\$27,100	\$28,459
Media - Specialist/Graphic Artist (LC: Systems & Graphic Designer)	\$31,314	\$26,162	\$43,184	\$43,817
Switchboard Operator	\$19,714	\$21,480	\$31,126	\$35,993
Administrative Assistant/Office Assistant (LC: Secretary I)	\$19,789	\$21,480	\$30,778	\$35,993
Administrative Assistant (LC: Secretary II)	\$21,125	\$23,622	\$36,650	\$39,764
Senior Administrative Assistant (LC: Administrative Secretary)	\$24,700	\$28,640	\$37,800	\$44,765
Executive Administrative Assistant (LC: Administrative Assistant to the President/ Secretary to the Board)	\$30,799	\$37,403	\$46,524	\$66,839
Accounting Specialist (LC: Accounting Clerk, Payroll Clerk)	\$27,000	\$26,162	\$43,272	\$43,817
Sergeant - Campus Police (LC: Security Captain)	\$32,869	\$28,258	\$53,851	\$46,262

Comments:

1. Target was
2. The regional medians come from Alvin Community College Salary Survey 2006-07 and LC Salary Scales 2006-07
3. Some of the positions represent reports from only one or two schools.
4. In cases where the job titles might be confusing, the Lee College title is included.
5. Overall, Lee College salaries compare favorably to the other regional schools who reported their salaries. Therefore, this indicator provides some indication that the college salaries contribute to the recruiting of well-qualified administrators and support staff.

---

Sources: Human Resource Officer and Alvin Community College Salary Survey, 2006-07.

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Each functional area will review the salaries shown.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

**Indicator 4.5 - Full Time Employee Retention Rate**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>No. of Employees 2003-04</b>	<b>03-04 Average Tenure Years</b>	<b>No. of Employees 2004-05</b>	<b>04-05 Average Tenure Years</b>	<b>No. of Employees 2005-06</b>	<b>05-06 Average Tenure Years</b>	<b>No. of Employees 2006-07</b>	<b>06-07 Average Tenure Years</b>	<b>No. of Employees 2007-08</b>	<b>07-08 Average Tenure Years</b>
Administrative	33	10.7	36	9.87	34	10.55	37	10.13	32	11.34
Administrative Support	40	7.45	35	8.17	36	8.11	28	8.09	28	8.54
Custodial	25	10.73	24	7.27	25	6.94	24	5.48	26	5.19
Faculty	153	13.6	152	13.6	158	13.52	167	12.14	172	10
Staff SRF	39	8.6	33	10.8	35	10.66	32	11.42	39	10.51
Secretarial/Clerical CLF	76	9.3	80	9.1	79	9.33	83	8.94	76	7.26
Totals by Year:	366		360		367		371		373	

Target was met.

---

Source: Human Resource Officer

---

Recommended Working Target: Functional areas will review the data each year. In general, the College will strive to have an average tenure of five years or longer for all employees.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

**Indicator 4.6 - Salary Comparisons - Part Time Faculty**

	% Increase					
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2006-07
Blinn College*	\$2,150	*	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$2,200	0.00%
Brazosport College	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	0.00%
College of the Mainland	\$1,530	\$1,530	\$1,530	\$1,584	\$1,584	0.00%
Galveston College	\$1,505	\$1,505	\$1,505	\$1,505	*	0.00%
Houston Community College	\$1,518	\$1,518	\$1,569	\$1,569	\$1,569	0.00%
<b>Lee College</b>	<b>\$1,650</b>	<b>\$1,650</b>	<b>\$1,650</b>	<b>\$1,650</b>	<b>\$1,650</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
North Harris Montgomery	\$1,632	\$1,632	\$1,632	\$1,632	\$1,728	5.88%
San Jacinto Jr. College Dist.*	\$1,440	*	\$1,536	*	*	0.00%
Wharton County Jr. College	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	0.00%
Alvin Community College	\$1,350	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	0.00%
Regional Average	<b>\$1,578</b>	<b>\$1,542</b>	<b>\$1,612</b>	<b>\$1,627</b>	<b>\$1,654</b>	<b>0.6%</b>

\*Data was unavailable.

Comments:

1. Target was not met. Compensation based on a 3 lecture hour course taught by Masters level instructor.
2. Average increased slightly. Corrections made to prior two years data from College of the Mainland.

---

Sources: Alvin Community College Annual Survey, 2006-07.

---

Recommended Working Target: The average Lee College salary will meet or exceed the regional average.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 5

**GOAL 5.** *We will improve the College’s linkages with business, industry, and other educational institutions, including high schools, colleges, and universities, to facilitate movement into the job market, within the job market, and/or transfers to this and other institutions.*

- Indicator 5.1 GED Training Program Success Rate*
- Indicator 5.2 High School Graduate Migration Rate for Baytown Campus*
- Indicator 5.3 Number of Students in Tech Prep Programs - Break-out by Program*
- Indicator 5.4 Number of Cooperation and Collaboration Initiatives*
- Indicator 5.5 Lee College, Baytown Migration Rates in Comparison to Gulf Coast Consortium Community Colleges*

**Summary of Indicators:**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target Met</b>	<b>Target Partially</b>	<b>Target Not Met</b>	<b>Not Evaluated</b>
5.1			X	
5.2	X			
5.3	X			
5.4	X			
5.5	X			

**Conclusion:**

Goal is marginally being met.

**Indicator 5.1 - GED Training Program Success Rate**

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	3-Year Average Attainment
Total GED Class Enrollment	297	228	207	
Number of ALC GED Students Tested	114	109	59	
Number of Students Attaining GED	48	59	32	
Attainment Rate GED	42%	54%	44%	
Total Pre-GED Class Enrollment	148	114	78	
Number of ALC Pre-GED Students Tested	27	28	4	
Number of Passing Scores	5	1	1	
Attainment Rate Pre-GED	19%	4%	6%	

Comments:

1. Target not met.
2. The educational services provided to the community through the Lee College Adult Learning Center (ALC) represents a cooperative effort between the College and Harris County Department of Education. Indirect costs are supported by the College. Direct costs and curriculum, recruitment and state reporting are handled through Harris County.
3. Students who complete the Pre-GED and/or GED classes at the Lee College ALC may elect to be tested through the Lee College Counseling Center. However, they are free to select another Harris County Dept. of Education testing site. Students passing the GED test at other sites are included in the numbers above.

---



---

Source: Lee College Counseling Center and Continuing Education Coordinator

---



---

Recommended Working Target: The Lee College Continuing Education Division reviews trends each year. EITHER: Increase attainment of GED each year. OR: Exceed the 3-year average GED attainment.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

***Indicator 5.2 - High School Graduate Migration Rate  
Baytown Campus***

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	5 Yr. Avg.
Number of High School Graduates	2353	2273	2292	2330	2325	2315
Current yr. grads attending LC	472	576	572	656	659	587
% of current yr. grads attending LC	20%	25%	25%	28%	28%	25%

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. This indicator is a measure of the effectiveness of Lee College recruiting efforts. These efforts have included the following initiatives: identifying and charging Lee College contact persons for each high school, maintaining contact with key high school counselors, teachers, and administrators; making regular calls to each high school; taking steps to ensure that each high school has ample supplies of Lee College brochures and other materials; establishing a referral system for potential students; and maintaining records of contacts and visits.

Schools: GCCISD, Barbers Hill, Crosby, East Chambers, Anahuac, Huffman, Dayton, Liberty, Hull Daisetta, Hardin, West Hardin

---

Source: Office of Institutional Research, [www.tea.state.tx.us](http://www.tea.state.tx.us)

---

Recommended Working Target: The percent of graduates attending Lee College be at least 25% of service area high school graduates.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

**Indicator 5.3 - Number of Students In Tech Prep Programs -  
Break Out by Program**

Program	Number Of Students				
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Accounting Technology	54	139	151	158	119
AC, Heat & Refrigeration	49	32	11	4	1
Business Management/General Business	211	209	230	158	137
Computer Maintenance Technology	123	132	138	111	118
Criminal Justice and Corrections	79	40	39	27	25
Electronics Technology	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Electronic Telecommunication	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Emergency Medical Technology	65	54	48	12	6
Health and Medical Admin Services	57	103	183	212	182
Legal Assistant	93	93	93	86	76
Pipefitting Technology	60	71	52	72	120
Process Technology	354	296	278	268	198
Registered Nursing (ADN)	540	793	920	1026	920
Welding Technology	176	165	128	152	204
Administrative and Secretarial Services	241	233	154	159	172
Totals	2,102	2,360	2,425	2,445	2,278
5 Year Average Number of Students	2,322				

Comments:

Target was met.

---

Source: Institutional Research

---

Recommended Working Target: Number of Tech Prep students either exceed or will be within 5% of the five-year average

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

***Indicator 5.4 - Number of Cooperation and Collaboration Initiatives***

<b>Description</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>5 year Avg</b>
Workforce Customized Training Contracts with Industry	12	12	15	47	9	19
Texas Workforce Commission Grants - Industry Partners					23	23
SBDC Business Breakfasts	11	11	11	11	11	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>34.6</b>

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. During 2006-07, the area has experienced severe manpower shortage, resulting in a drastic increase of Training Contracts.
3. SBDC workshops are planned for the second Wednesday of each month except for December.

---



---

Source: Industrial Liason, SBDC, CE Director

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Number of initiatives will either exceed the 5-year average or be within 5% of the 5-year average

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

***Indicator 5.5 - Lee College, Baytown Migration Rates in Comparison to Gulf Coast Consortium Community Colleges***

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Fall 2001 to Fall 2002</b>	<b>Fall 2002 to Fall 2003</b>	<b>Fall 2003 to Fall 2004</b>	<b>Fall 2004 to Fall 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2005 to Fall 2006</b>	<b>Five Year Average</b>
Alvin Community College	9.22%	8.63%	11.09%	11.54%	10.66%	10.23%
Brazosport Community College	9.90%	9.87%	11.01%	11.56%	10.57%	10.58%
College of the Mainland	9.53%	9.37%	10.50%	10.89%	11.82%	10.42%
Galveston College	11.24%	10.69%	10.67%	10.93%	12.28%	11.16%
Houston Community College	10.70%	11.35%	13.15%	12.89%	13.57%	12.33%
<b>Lee College</b>	<b>4.54%</b>	<b>5.06%</b>	<b>5.02%</b>	<b>6.01%</b>	<b>6.24%</b>	<b>5.37%</b>
<b>Lee College Estimate - w/o HCLC</b>	<b>5.60%</b>	<b>6.20%</b>	<b>6.05%</b>	<b>7.40%</b>	<b>6.49%</b>	<b>6.35%</b>
NHMCCCD: Cy-Fair College		18.01%	15.95%	14.08%	14.82%	15.72%
NHMCCCD: Kingwood College	12.84%	12.21%	14.13%	14.18%	13.30%	13.33%
NHMCCCD: Montgomery College	13.59%	12.42%	14.53%	14.58%	14.74%	13.97%
NHMCCCD: North Harris College	8.27%	7.98%	10.02%	8.99%	10.66%	9.18%
NHMCCCD: Tomball College	14.46%	11.71%	15.04%	13.89%	14.97%	14.01%
San Jacinto College - N. Campus	9.38%	6.53%	7.17%	7.17%	7.38%	7.53%
San Jacinto College - S. Campus	6.63%	9.45%	10.72%	11.20%	10.03%	9.61%
San Jacinto College - Central	10.41%	8.85%	10.26%	9.74%	10.15%	9.88%
Wharton County Jr. College	13.90%	14.23%	16.00%	16.13%	15.98%	15.25%
<b>Consortium Average</b>	<b>10.33%</b>	<b>10.42%</b>	<b>12.16%</b>	<b>11.98%</b>	<b>12.21%</b>	<b>11.42%</b>
State Average	10.73%	10.49%	12.35%	12.14%	12.35%	11.61%

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Percents shown reflect those students who were enrolled in a public community college and then transferred to a public senior college or university. The data are taken from the CBM-001 student report, which records students enrolled on the official census date in semester length courses. Students were tracked through their social security numbers.
3. Previous Migration Reports combined the North Harris Montgomery Colleges. Now each site is on a separate report.

---

Sources: Student Migration Report

---

Recommended Working Target: Either increase rate each year or be within 5% of the consortium average

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 6

**GOAL 6.** *We will continue expanding the college’s commitment to the economic development of the region by expanding training partnerships with business and industry and by providing opportunities for workers to upgrade their skills.*

*Indicator 6.1 Lee College Students Employed in Their Field One Year after Completing Technical/Vocational Programs Compared to the State Standards*

*Indicator 6.2a Applied Science Industry Contact Hours*

*Indicator 6.2b Community Education Contact Hours*

*Indicator 6.2c Number of Small Business Development Center (SBDC) Contacts*

*Indicator 6.3 Applied Science and Community Education Advisory Committee Meetings*

*Indicator 6.4 Applied Science and Community Education Program Reviews*

### Summary of Indicators:

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially	Target Not Met
6.1		X	
6.2a	X		
6.2b	X		
6.2c			X
6.3	X		
6.4	X		

### Conclusion:

Goal has been met.

**Indicator 6.1 - Lee College Students Employed in Their Field After Completing Technical/Vocational Programs Compared to the State Standards**

Program Name	3-Year Place/Trans Rate	3-Year State Average	No. of LC Grads
		Place/Transfer Rate	Last Three Years
Horticulture Svcs Operation & Management	N/A	N/A	233
Graphic Communications	100.00%	91.09%	11
Computer Programming	75.00%	91.09%	9
Data Processing Technology	100.00%	90.68%	137
Data Entry / Microcomputer Applications	87.50%	86.00%	17
Computer/Info Tech/Admin & Mgt	N/A	91.32%	104
Cosmetic Services	80.00%	88.26%	25
Electrical & Electronic Engr Related Tech	100.00%	94.10%	278
Electromechanical Instrumentation & Maint Tech	98.94%	96.65%	104
Computer Engineering Technologies / Technician	95.74%	94.51%	83
Drafting/Desugn Engr Technology / Technician	91.07%	91.75%	82
Legal Support Services	88.24%	91.85%	57
Physical (Process) Technologies	98.77%	96.90%	290
Criminal Justice & Corrections	94.74%	93.41%	23
Electrical & Pwr Transmission Installers	100.00%	93.02%	61
Plumbers & Pipefitters	100.00%	96.43%	60
Heating, A/C & Refrigeration Mechanics	100.00%	91.58%	161
Autobody Collision & Repair Technology	N/A	90.03%	64
Automoblie Mechanics Technology	N/A	92.83%	84
Diesel Mechanics Technology	N/A	95.96%	95
Precision Metal Workers/Machinist	100.00%	95.74%	36
Welder	96.00%	92.91%	152
Air Transportation Workers	86.67%	95.43%	9
Vehicle and Equipment Operators	N/A	N/A	186
Dental Services	N/A	95.70%	47
Health & Medical Svcs (Transcription, HITT)	89.36%	92.44%	68
Emergency Medical Technology	80.00%	97.51%	5
Mental Health Services	93.75%	92.11%	15
Nursing	99.10%	97.79%	125
LVN	96.20%	96.98%	72
Business Administration & Management	100.0%	92.5%	62
Accounting	100.0%	93.4%	43
Administrative & Secretarial Services	95.7%	91.5%	352

Comments:

1. Target was partially met.
2. The State considers an Applied Science program that achieves an 85% rate for graduates in the employed or transfer category as a successful outcome.
3. Programs with fewer than nine graduates in a three year period fail to meet state completion guidelines and are candidates for deactivation.
4. Data is from the THECB Data Resources Measure VI, Employment Outcomes, and Measure VII, Degree Attainment.

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordination Board Data Resources for Perkins Measures and Standards

Recommended Targets:

1. 85% of Lee College technical program students, who complete either a degree or certificate will be employed or in a transfer program.
2. Each technical program, per three year period, will have at least nine graduates.

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

2. Each technical program, per three year period, will have at least nine graduates.

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

**Indicator 6.2a - Applied Science Industry Contact Hours**

	<b>95-96</b>	<b>96-97</b>	<b>97-98</b>	<b>98-99</b>	<b>99-00</b>	<b>00-01</b>	<b>01-02</b>	<b>02-03</b>
Credit Contact Hours	175,968	129,072	129,936	99,024	94,896	133,968	100,800	102,192
Non-Credit Contact Hours	74,800	26,856	60,424	38,008	32,200	37,824	11,524	2,624
<b>Total Contact Hours</b>	<b>250,768</b>	<b>155,928</b>	<b>190,360</b>	<b>137,032</b>	<b>127,096</b>	<b>171,792</b>	<b>112,324</b>	<b>104,816</b>

	<b>03-04</b>	<b>04-05</b>	<b>05-06</b>	<b>06-07</b>
Credit Contact Hours	92,064	59,136	66,576	110,554
Non-Credit Contact Hours	7,904	2,736	8,816	6,808
<b>Total Contact Hours</b>	<b>99,968</b>	<b>61,872</b>	<b>75,392</b>	<b>117,362</b>

Comments:

1. Target was met.

---

Source: Chief Academic Officer

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Increase the number of contact hours each year.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

***Indicator 6.2b -Community Education Contact Hours***

	<b>02-03</b>	<b>03-04</b>	<b>04-05</b>	<b>05-06</b>	<b>06-07</b>
Funded Contact Hours	116,586	116,180	133,847	144,630	190,721
Non-Funded Contact Hours	232,140	240,978	252,764	225,119	187,131
Total Contact Hours	348,726	357,158	386,611	369,749	377,852

Comments:

Target was met.

---



---

Source: Continuing Education Coordinator

---



---



---



---

Recommended Working Target: Increase the number of contact hours each year.

---



---



---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

***Indicator 6.2c - Number of Small Business Development Center Contacts***

	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07
Number of Contacts	433	441	450	474	265

Comments:

1. Target was not met.

---



---

Source: Small Business Development Center

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Increase the number of contacts each year.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

**Indicator 6.3 - Applied Science and Community Education  
Advisory Committee Meetings**

PROGRAM	2006-07 NUMBER OF ADVISORY MEETINGS
HCLC Air Conditioning	
HCLC Auto Body	
HCLC Auto Mechanics	
HCLC Microcomputer Networking	
HCLC Electronics	
HCLC Dental Lab **	
HCLC Telecommunications	
HCLC Diesel Mechanics	
HCLC Electronics & Telecommunications	
HCLC Horticulture	
HCLC Truck Driving	
HCLC Welding	
RN	1
LVN	1
Health Information Technology	2
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counseling	2
Pipe Fitting	2
Electrical	1
Machine Shop	2
Computer Maintenance Electronics	1
Process Technology	2
Instrumentation	1
Welding	2
Cosmetology	2
Computer Information Systems	1
Career Pilot	1
Design Drafting	2
Law Enforcement/Criminal Justice	1
Accounting Technology	1
Business Administration and Management *	1
Legal Assistant	2
Office Technology	1

\* General Business, Management, and Business Management combined to form Business recommendation.

1. Target was met.
2. Programs need to ensure advisory committees meet at least once a year.

---

Source: Chief Academic Officer

---

Recommended Working Target: All programs will conduct a minimum of one advisory committee meeting per year.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

**Indicator 6.4-Applied Science and Community Education Program Reviews**

	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
Number of Possible Applied Sciences Program Reviews	39	39	39	39	39	39
Number of Applied Sciences Program Reviews Conducted	3	9	0	0	0	3

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Number of Possible Applied Sciences Program Reviews	39	39	38	38	31	20*
Number of Applied Sciences Program Reviews Conducted	9	5	7	9	4	3**

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Number of program reviews includes a combination of AAS degrees and certificate programs which would be covered under the same review. Thus, for example, the Process Technology and Systems Support Technology AAS degree programs would be reviewed concurrently.
3. A new program review model was under development in 1996-97, 1997-98, and 1998-99; therefore, no program reviews were conducted in these three years.

\* Reflects LC Campus only

\*\* 4 programs originally scheduled in 06-07. Of these, DAAC was moved to 07-08 year and will be combined with AND and LVN reviews.

---



---

Source: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Program reviews will be conducted on a five year cycle.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 7

**GOAL 7.** *We will maintain a safe and inviting physical environment.*

- Indicator 7.1      Annual Campus Security Report*
- Indicator 7.2      Safety Inspection Item Completion Rate*
- Indicator 7.3      Number of Infrastructure Upgrade Projects Completed*
- Indicator 7.4      Preventive Maintenance Program Success*
- Indicator 7.5      Number of Accidents Reported*

**Summary of Indicators:**

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially Met	Target Not Met	Not Evaluated
7.1	X			
7.2	X			
7.3	X			
7.4			X	
7.5	X			

**Conclusion:**

Goal is being met.

### Indicator 7.1 - Annual Campus Security Incidents

			2007	2007	2007
	2006	2007	National Avg. Incidents per Institution	Regional Avg. Incidents per Institution	State Avg. Incidents per Institution
Murder/Non Negligent Manslaughter	0	0	0	0	0
Forcible Sex Offense	0	0	0	0	0
Nonforcible Sex Offense	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0
Aggravated Assault	0	0	0	0	0
Burglary	0	1	1	4	5
Motor Vehicle Theft	1	0	0	0	0
Arson	0	0	0	0	0
Negligent Manslaughter	0	0	0	0	0
Hate Crimes	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Arrests for:					
Liquor Law Violations	0	0	1	2	3
Drug Abuse Violations	1	0	0	2	3
Weapons Violations	0	0	0	0	0
Persons Referred for Discipline:					
Liquor Law Violations	0	0	3	3	43
Drug Abuse Violations	0	0	0	0	8
Weapons Violations	0	0	0	0	1

Lee College Data is for the Baytown, San Jacinto Mall, and Crosby campuses.  
Regional data includes the states of Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Lee College is doing well with this indicator.  
At the time of this IERC's publication security initiatives for network security cameras had been completed on the Baytown campus. A new ID access card is to be implemented in Spring of 2008. A new alarm system is to be implemented in Spring of 2008.
3. Individuals may report crimes and emergencies by contacting Lee College Security at either extension 6475 or via the hotline 6888. If off campus, the numbers are 281-425-6475 or 281-425-6888. Campus security personnel have a radio link to the red phones placed throughout the campus. Depending on the nature of the situation, campus security personnel will respond and may contact EMT or BPD.
4. In general, College security personnel will prepare an incident report for every occurrence involving a crime or an emergency. These reports are made available to the campus community in two ways. First, they are reviewed on a regular basis by the College's Security and Safety Committee. Second, the reports are available for review at any time in the campus security office in the Student Center.
5. Security and access to buildings is controlled by Lee College Security, which opens and closes all facilities.
6. Lee College employs commissioned security officers, however, these individuals are not peace officers. They are not authorized to carry weapons and cannot arrest individuals. Law enforcement actions are handled through contacting the BPD. Students are encouraged to report crimes by Student Congress, presentations by campus security personnel, and via campus posters.
7. Lee College does not condone on campus the possession, use, and sale of alcoholic beverages. The College will report to the Dean of Student Services and Institutional Planning for discipline any individuals caught possessing, using, or selling alcoholic beverages.
8. The College does not condone on campus the possession, use, and sale of illegal drugs. The College will report to the BPD any individuals caught possessing, using or selling illegal drugs.
9. Lee College Counselors may refer students to drug and alcohol abuse education or counseling. However, the College does not sponsor and pay for such education or counseling. Employees are covered under the auspices of the College's Employee Assistance Program (EAP).
10. The Annual Campus Security Report can be viewed on the College web site at the following web address: [http://www.lee.edu/security/annual\\_report.asp](http://www.lee.edu/security/annual_report.asp)

---

Sources: Lee College Campus Security Reports; Department of Education Campus Crime Statistics

---

Recommended Target: Lee College will have fewer incidents in each category in comparison to national, state, and regional averages.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Administrative Services

---

**Indicator 7.2 - Safety Inspection Item Completion Rate**

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Number of Safety Items	9	15	5	10	21
Number of Safety Items Completed	8	14	5	9	20
Number of Safety Items in Progress	1	1	0	1	1
Percentage of Safety Items in Progress or Completed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Above numbers are based on data gathered through July 2008.
3. Examples of projects that addressed Safety problems in 2007-08 included:  
 Asbestos Abatement: BH 101,109,120,121,219,221: Social Science Mechanical Room: TV-2 101B,110B:TV3 101,112,114: Rebel Roost Floor tile in Food Storage Room; Installed two Emergency Gas Generators and associated piping, foundations and electrical connections; repaired /resurfaced Bonner and Tucker parking lots: installed new asphalt parking lot #19: replaced damaged stairwell tiles in ATC and Arena; replaced outside damaged stairs at Maintenance building: replaced overload controls at Main High Voltage Switch Gear: Replaced damaged 15KV Underground High Voltage cabling at Bonner Hall: replaced wheelchair ramp at TV-2: Installed outdoor safety lights at Day Care Center :replaced damaged walkway between Bonner and Molar: installed driveway for Rebel Roost food deliveries: Removed underground leaking steam line at Science building: Repaired leaking Kajar water fountain: installed Chiller Plant driveway : Installed student walkway from Arena exit

4. Additional Asbestos Testing Information:

Path of Construction/Emergency Sampling	Year	Complete Surveys	Year
South Central Plant	Sep-06	Moler Hall	Aug-06
Multiple Buildings	Sep-06	909 Decker	Aug-06
Multiple Buildings	Oct-06	McNulty Haddick	Feb-07
Moler Hall	Oct-06	201 S. Whiting Building	Aug-07
Multiple Buildings	Oct-06	Social Sciences	Mar-08
Multiple Buildings	Nov-06	Bonner Hall	Sep-08
Multiple Buildings	Jan-07	Rundell Hall	Sep-08
Rebel Roost Storage Room	Jan-07		
909 Decker/HVAC Pipes	Feb-07		
Crosby Cosmetology	Feb-07		
Second Floor Mechanical Room, Music Wing	Feb-07		
Social Sciences	Feb-07		
TV 2	Feb-07		
South Central Plant	Apr-07		
TV 1 and TV 4 Buildings	Apr-07		
TV 2	Apr-07		
TV3 and TV4 Buildings	May-07		
Tucker Auditorium	Jun-07		
Fieldbus and Social Sciences Buildings	Jul-07		
Multiple Buildings	Jul-07		
Social Sciences	Aug-07		
McNulty Haddick Complex	Nov-07		
First Floor Mechanical Room, Rundell Hall	Nov-07		
Bonner Hall/Day Care Center	Dec-07		
McNulty Haddick Complex	Dec-07		
Bonner Hall	Jan-08		
Social Sciences	Mar-08		
Cobb Auditorium	Jun-08		
South Central Plant	Dec-08		

---

Source: Lee College Security and Safety Committee, Safety Inspection Reports, Asbestos Surveys, Various Planning Proposals

---

Recommended Working Target: Monitor each year to see if adjustments are needed.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Administrative Services

---

***Indicator 7.3 - Number of Infrastructure Upgrade Program Projects Completed in 2007-2008***

Number of Projects Completed or Underway	23
--	----

Comments:

A. Target was met.

B. Projects completed and/or in progress include:

1. Social Science - New window blinds
2. ATC/Arena - Replaced sundamaged stair treads
3. Moler Hall (Rebel Roost) - Installed second delivery driveway to Rebel Roost
4. Bonner/Moler Hall - Replaced damaged sidewalk between Bonner Hall & Moler Hall
5. Arena/North Central Plant - added new walkway at Arena and driveway at North Campus Chiller Plant
6. MH-Rebel Roost - New floor in storage room area
7. Daycare - New outdoor carpeting
8. MHC - Added Allied Health security doorway
9. Repaired Rebel Roost grease trap
10. Arena/Gym - Resurfaced Arena/Gym floors
11. Tennis Courts - Caulked perimeter of Tennis Courts
12. Installed carpeting in multiple offices & classrooms
13. Campus wide signage installed
14. Campus Wide - Multiple asbestos abatement on campus
15. South CP - Installed condensor pump on South Central Plant
16. SS - Painting of classrooms and offices
17. Daycare - New exterior security light
18. Campus -Installed U/G electric service cable from Main to TV7 to Bonner Hall and to Moler Hall
19. Replaced the fault protection on campus 12.5 KV electric service
20. Parking Lots - Surfaced Parking Lot 19, added fence around perimeter
21. Resurfaced Tucker and Bonner Hall parking lots
22. Parking Lot - Added temporary parking lot off Gulf Street
23. Replaced toilet partitions in several buildings

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Administrative Services

***INDICATOR 7.4 - Preventive Maintenance Program Work Order Completion Rate for the Maintenance Department***

	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
HVAC	131	138	117	140	161
Plumber	63	89	55	106	116
Carpenter	71	92	38	55	52
Custodial	0	1	0	0	0
Electrical	60	84	50	50	69
Painter	3	6	1	0	0
Roof	68	79	68	54	76
Other	0	27	1	15	42
Total # of Work Orders Open at Beginning:	14	17	26	46	115
Total # of Work Orders Issued:	410	516	423	420	516
Total # of Work Orders Closed:	396	499	397	374	443
Total # of Work Orders Open at End:	28	34	52	92	188
% of Work Orders Completed:	96%	97%	94%	89%	86%

Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. Due to re-assignment of department's personnel to campus priority projects as well as loss of pm time due

---

Source: Work Order Database in Plant Maintenance

---

Recommended Working Target: At least 90% of the work orders scheduled in the Preventive Maintenance Program will be completed.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Director of Physical Plant

---

## *Indicator 7.5 - Number of Accidents Reported*

	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	Total	5 Yr Avg
Slip, Trip, and Fall	4	5	2	5	6	22	4.4
Strains Other Than Lifting	2	0	3	2	6	13	2.6
Strains from Lifting	0	2	10	1	1	14	2.8
Caught between, Struck by, and Stepped on Objects	0	5	0	1	3	9	1.8
Cuts	1	0	0	0	5	6	1.2
Misc. Described Causes	2	3	1	0	0	6	1.2
Misc. Non Described Causes	0	0	1	0	1	2	0.4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>14.4</b>

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Only employee accidents are reported on this indicator.

---

Source: First reports of injury processed through HR.

---

Recommended Working Target: Review data each year. Total will remain at or below the 5 year average.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Human Resources and Dean of Administrative Services

---

## Effectiveness for Goal 8

**GOAL 8.** *We will provide a cost-effective utilization of human, physical, fiscal, and technological resources.*

*Indicator 8.1 Cost per Full Time Equivalent Student*

*Indicator 8.2a Headcount*

*Indicator 8.2b Contact Hours*

*Indicator 8.3 Budget Percentages*

### Summary of Indicators:

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially	Target Not Met
8.1	X		
8.2a		X	
8.2b	X		
8.3	X		

### Conclusion:

Goal is being met.

**Indicator 8.1 - Cost Per Full Time Equivalent Student (FTE) - Regional Calculations**

	2005-06	2005-06 Regional Average
FTE	3,602	
Instructional Cost	\$17,705,716	
Instructional Cost per FTE	\$4,916	\$4,292
Non-Instructional Cost	\$16,263,991	
Non-Instructional Cost per FTE	\$4,515	\$3,883
<b>Total Cost per FTE</b>	<b>\$9,431</b>	<b>\$8,175</b>

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. Lee College's cost per FTE is 15% higher than the regional average, which indicates that the college is devoting a reasonable amount of funding per FTE student.
3. FTEs are calculated by dividing the annual total of semester credit hours from the The CB Annual Data Profile for an institution by 30.

---

Source: Annual Financial Reports, THECB Annual Data Profiles, Lee College Office of Institutional Research

---

Recommended Working Target: Lee College cost per FTE will be within 25% of the required average

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

**Indicator 8.2a - Headcount**

<b>Headcount</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>% Difference</b>
Duplicated	17,749	16,828	-5.19%
Unduplicated	10,289	11,153	8.40%

## Comments:

1. Target was partially met.
2. Included in these numbers are total credit and funded continuing education students, including flex-entry.

---



---

Source of Data: Lee College Office of Institutional Research

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Duplicated and unduplicated headcount will meet or exceed the previous year.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---



---

***Indicator 8.2b - Contact Hours***

	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>% Difference</b>
Total Contact Hours	2,765,905	2,930,913	5.97%

Comments:

1. Target was met
2. Included in these numbers are total credit and funded continuing education students.

---

---

Source of Data: Lee College Office of Institutional Research

---

---

Recommended Working Target: Contact hours will meet or exceed the previous year.

---

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Student Services for Development & Success

---

---

**Indicator 8.3 - Budget Percentages**

	2005-06 Amount	LC Percent of 2006-07 Total Expenditures	Regional Percent of 2006-07 Total Expenditures
Instruction as a Percent of Total Expenditures	\$17,705,716	40%	45%
Non-Teaching Payroll as a Percent of Total Expenditures	\$16,623,991	37%	41%

Comments:

1. Target was met.
  
2. Statistical Supplement 3 from the annual financial report was used to prepare this indicator. The items on the statement is used to represent "Instruction" were the amounts shown for Instruction and Academic Support. The items on the statement used to represent Non-Instruction were: Student Services, Institutional Support, and Operation and Maintenance of Plant.

Source of Data: Dean of Financial Services, Annual Financial Reports, Statistical Supplements for Wharton County Junior College, HCCS, Galveston College, COM, Alvin Community College, and Brazosport Community College.

Recommended Working Target: Lee College's percents will be within 5% of the regional average.

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

## Indicators of Effectiveness for Goal 9

**GOAL 9.** *We will enhance students' knowledge of other cultures and their understanding of global issues by promoting an international perspective, awareness, and understanding..*

*Indicator 9.1 Internationalize the Curriculum Through Cultural Events*

*Indicator 9.2 Faculty Development*

*Indicator 9.3 Curriculum Development*

*Indicator 9.4 Community Partnership*

### Summary of Indicators:

Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially	Target Not Met
9.1	X		
9.2	X		
9.3	X		
9.4	X		

### Conclusion:

Goal is marginally being met.

***Indicator 9.1 - Internationalize the campus through cultural events  
2007-2008***

Continuation of Multicultural Institute
Continuation of Fulbright Scholar Lectures
Observe International Education Week
Host performance of Chinese New Year Lion Dance

Comments:

1. Target was met. 17 students applied to the institute. More than 50% participated in 5 or more of the 8 institute events. 4 qualified for Honors Day Recognition as
2. Target met. Dr. Edmundo Gonzalez of Peru and Miss Li Jiang of China presented four public lectures and visited 7 classrooms.
3. Target met. 45 students attended the International Student Luncheon.
4. Target met. 136 people attended the performance on Feb. 1, 2008

---



---

Source: International Education Committee

---



---

Recommended Working Targets: Indicator will be reviewed each year to review completion and trends.

---



---

Offices of Primary Responsibility: International Education Committee

---



---

***Indicator 9.2 - Faculty Development***

**Faculty Development**

Provide two opportunities for faculty members to increase enhance their cultural awareness.

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. One faculty member attended the International Education Conference sponsored by the Gulf Coast International Education Consortum and North Harris County Community College in April.
3. 19 faculty members attended lectures or informal meetings with visiting Fulbright scholars.
4. 3 faculty members attended the International Education Week Luncheon.

---

---

Source: International Education Committee

---

---

Recommended Working Target: Indicator will be reviewed each year to review completion and trend.

---

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: International Education Committee

---

---

***Indicator 9.3 - Curriculum Development***

Continue review of Global Studies Program

Comments:

1. Courses no longer taught were eliminated from the Global Studies Program. No new courses were introduced.

2. Target was met.

---

---

Source: International Education Committee

---

---

Recommended Working Target: Indicator will be reviewed each year to review completion and trend.

---

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: International Education Committee

---

---

***Indicator 9.4 - Community Partnerships***

Gulf Coast International Education Consortium
Kukulcan Spanish Learning Community
The Pilot Club of Baytown

Comments:

1. The LC IE Coordinator served as secretary of this organization. Campus obligations. A second faculty member acted as chairman of the Poster Contest for the International Education Conference hosted by GCIEC and Lone Star College in April.
2. Target was met. LC and Kukulcan signed an articulation agreement allowing students to transfer sophomore level Spanish language credits to Lee College.
3. Target was not met. The Pilot Club of Baytown ended its partnership with Lee College to provide a \$500 annual scholarship to an International Student.

---

Source: International Education Committee

---

Recommended Working Target: Indicator will be reviewed each year to review completion and trend.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: International Education Committee

---

# Effectiveness for Goal 10

**GOAL 10.** *We will support community service through a variety of activities.*

- Indicator 10.1 Facility Rental*
- Indicator 10.2 Operating Budget Commitment to Community Service*
- Indicator 10.3 Scholarship Funds Committed to Senior Citizen Programs*
- Indicator 10.4 Community Service Activities*
- Indicator 10.5 Participation in HEAC and BEAC*

**Summary of Indicators:**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target Met</b>	<b>Target Partially</b>	<b>Target Not Met</b>
10.1	X		
10.2	X		
10.3	X		
10.4	X		
10.5	X		

**Conclusion:**  
Goal has been met.

***Indicator 10.1 - Facility Rental***

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	Five Year Average
Number of Rentals	53	42	15	39	90	48
Rental Fees	\$26,057.00	\$26,968.00	\$9,205.00	\$18,297.00	\$11,367.50	\$ 18,378.90

Comments:

1. Target was met.

---

Source: Peoplesoft Budget Report, Dean of Financial Services, Interim Facility Coordinator

---

Recommended Working Target: Indicator will be reviewed each year to review trends in facility rental.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Administrative Services  
Dean of Financial Services

---

**Indicator 10.2 - Operating Budget Commitment to Community Service**

	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>Five Year Average</b>
Budget for Community Service	\$63,681.00	\$74,267.00	\$79,022.00	\$82,972.00	\$89,526.00	\$77,893.60
Total Operating Budget	\$28,631,372.00	\$30,088,243.00	\$31,774,697.00	\$34,209,953.00	\$35,019,691.00	\$31,944,791.20
% of Budget to Community Service	0.22%	0.25%	0.25%	0.24%	0.26%	0.24%

Comments:

1. Target was met.
  
2. This indicator is designed to reflect an aspect of the College's commitment to community service. The community services included in this indicator are Baytown Symphony Orchestra, Community Chorus, and the Senior Citizen Program.

---

Source: Lee College Annual Financial Report and Lee College Budget

---

Recommended Working Target: Indicator will be reviewed each year to review trends.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Financial Services

---

***Indicator 10.3 - Scholarship Funds Committed to Senior Citizen Programs***

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Scholarship Funds Committed to Senior Citizen Program	\$40,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000

Comments:

1. Target was met.

---



---

Source of Data: Lee College Budget

---



---

Recommended Working Target: Review trends each year.

---



---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Dean of Strategic & Economic Development

---



---

**Indicator 10.4 - Community Service Activities**

	2004-05			2005-06			2006-07		
	Members	Attendees	# of Events	Members	Attendees	# of Events	Members	Attendees	# of Events
Lee College Theater Productions	35	700	5	*	950	27	49	1,950	37
Baytown Symphony Orchestra Concerts	60	5,000	5	60	3,100	5	62	3,500	5
Baytown Community Band/Jazz Ensemble Concerts	75	45,000	10	80	39,000	12	75	39,000	14
Lee College Faculty Brass Concerts	6	2,500	5	6	2,500	5	5	1,500	2
Baytown Community Chorus Concerts	45	1,800	3	65	1,800	4	65	850	3
LC Concert Choir	22	*	2	18	1,000	4	25	700	2
LC Music Dept. Student Recitals	35	200	5	25	200	5	25	200	6
LC Music Dept. Performance Lecture/Seminars	25	300	16	15	200	8	15	30	2
LC Visual Art Area	3	100	3	8	700	5	25	1,015	7
Lee College Lyceum Events			6			15			2
Totals	306	55,600	60	277	49,450	90	346	48,745	80

Comments:

\* Data unavailable

1. Target is being met.

---

Source: Lee College Visual and Performing Arts Division, the Dean of Student Services, and Student Activities Coordinator

---

Recommended Working Target: Review trends each year.

---

Office of Primary Responsibility: Chief Academic Officer

---

**Indicator 10.5 - Participation in BEAC and HEAC**

	2001-02			2002-03			2003-04			2004-05		
	# of Members	# of Attendees	# of Events	# of Members	# of Attendees	# of Events	# of Members	# of Attendees	# of Events	# of Members	# of Attendees	# of Events
Black Educational Access Committee	79	2,803	15	80	1,290	7	82	1,172	9	84	1,090	9
Hispanic Educational Access Committee	20	440	8	67	660	6	67	445	8	20	670	11
Joint BEAC and HEAC Events	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	99	3,243	23	147	1,950	13	149	1,617	17	104	1760	20

	2005-06			2006-07			2007-08		
	# of Members	# of Attendees	# of Events	# of Members	# of Attendees	# of Events	# of Members	# of Attendees	# of Events
Black Educational Access Committee	80	1,745	7	80	500	7	95	575	5
Hispanic Educational Access Committee	29	700	15	20	750	12	25	800	12
Joint BEAC and HEAC Events	0	20	1	0	0	1	60	400	4
Totals	109	2,465	23	100	1,250	20	180	1,775	21

Comments:

1. Target was met.
2. For 2008-09 the indicators for Participation in BEAC and HEAC can no longer be measured by attendance at events. As a result of Achieving the Dream data that identifies minorities as those students underperforming in gatekeeper courses and enrolling at a lower rate, BEAC and HEAC activities and process are now refocused to reflect diversity, recruitment, access, inclusion and persistence of minority students. Therefore, indicators should be updated to accurately track progress towards meeting this goal.

---

Source: Lee College liaisons with HEAC and BEAC (Crystal Bessix, Dionne Maxie, and Bo Aguilar)

---

Recommended Working Target: Indicators must be updated. Minority enrollment and persistence indicators should be included.

---

Achieving the Dream

Office of Primary Responsibility: Marketing, Recruiting & Public Relations  
Office of Diversity & Community Partnerships

---

**Summary of QEP Assessment Targets  
2006-2007**

**QEP Objective 1. Students will increase critical thinking skills.**

*Indicator QEP 1.1 California Critical Thinking Skills Test*

*Indicator QEP 1.2 Nelson Denny Reading Test*

*Indicator QEP 1.3 Critical Thinking/Reading Component of Core Curriculum Assessment*

**QEP Objective 2. Faculty Learning Communities (FLC) will utilize pedagogical practices that promote critical thinking.**

*Indicator QEP 2.1 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)*

*Indicator QEP 2.2 Number of FLC courses designed with Critical Thinking Strategies*

*Indicator QEP 2.3 Number of FLC courses that implement pedagogical strategies that promote student learning of critical thinking skills.*

**QEP Objective 3. Lee College will utilize active learning methodologies.**

*Indicator QEP 3.1 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)*

*Indicator QEP 3.2 Number of FLC courses designed with Active Learning Strategies*

*Indicator QEP 3.3 Number of FLC courses that implement pedagogical strategies that promote active learning*

## Indicators of Effectiveness for QEP Objective 1

**QEP Objective 1. Students will increase critical thinking skills.**

*Indicator QEP 1.1 California Critical Thinking Skills Test*

*Indicator QEP 1.2 Nelson Denny Reading Test*

*Indicator QEP 1.3 Critical Thinking/Reading Component of Core Curriculum Assessment*

### Summary of Indicators:

QEP Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially Met	Target Not Met
QEP 1.1		X	
QEP 1.2		X	
QEP 1.3	X		

### Conclusions:

QEP Objective 1 evaluation process is being reviewed.

**Indicator QEP 1.1 - California Critical Thinking Skills Test**

	Sample Headcount	Aggregate Sample Mean Score	% Change
Sample 2005-2006	496	12.431	-
Spring 2007 Pretest	209	13.297	
Spring 2007 Post Test	156	13.622	2.4%

Paired Results	Sample Headcount	Aggregate Sample Mean	% Change
Spring 2007 Pretest	139	13.64	
Spring 2007 Post Test	139	14.08	3.2%

## Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. Thirty-three percent scored  $\geq 14.7$  aggregate sampled mean.
3. Paired results comparing pretest and post test results show a **3.2%** change. Target not met.
4. QEP Committee was not satisfied with benchmark and is considering a different test which will make our target related to the aggregate sample norm.
5. Insight Assessment Consultant recommends Lee College consider using *The Every Day Reasoning* instrument, which is the parallel instrument to California Critical Thinking Skills test for the Community College population. It evaluates the same parameters, but is designed for the Community College population. Also, the Consultant suggested that the targets are set too high for any population.

---



---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

Insight Assessment Consultant Blohm

---



---

Recommended Target: EITHER 80% of Lee College FLC students will exceed the national aggregate for two year college students on the CCT skills test OR post-test results in comparison to pre-test results show a minimum increase of five percentile points.

---



---

***Indicator QEP 1.2 - Nelson Denny Reading Test***

	Sample Headcount	National Mean Score	% Change
Sample 2005-2006	493	20.856	-
Spring 2007 Pretest	174	23.529	
Spring 2007 Post Test	126	24.063	2.3%

Paired Results	Sample Headcount	Aggregate Sample Mean Score	% Change
Spring 2007 Pretest	109	23.95	
Spring 2007 Post Test	109	24.76	3.4%

Comments:

1. Target not met.
2. Paired results comparing pretest to post test show a 3.4% increase.
3. Measurements were not accurate. The committee is investigating a more meaningful way to evaluate this indicator.

---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---



---

Recommended Target: EITHER Lee College FLC students will exceed the national mean for two year colleges on the Nelson Denny Reading Comprehension Test OR post-test results in comparison to pre-test results will be 12% Higher.

---

*Indicator QEP 1.3 -Critical Thinking/Reading Component of Core Curriculum Assessment*

Academic Year	Percent Mastering Assessment
2006-2007	100%

## Comments:

1. Target was met.
  
2. 100% of the sample artifacts from LC students selected for Core Assessment received a 3 or higher.
  
3. The sample size was small for the Critical Thinking/Reading category (N=4). The Core Assessment team will work to standardize the rubric and will provide instructions to the faculty for submitting the artifact that will allow the Core Assessment team to better evaluate the artifact.

---



---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---



---

Recommended Target: 90% of Lee College graduates will demonstrate mastery of the critical thinking/reading component of the core curriculum assessment instrument.

---



---

## Indicators of Effectiveness for QEP Objective 2

**QEP Objective 2. Faculty Learning Communities (FLC) will utilize pedagogical practices that promote critical thinking.**

*Indicator QEP 2.1 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)*

*Indicator QEP 2.2 Number of FLC courses designed with Critical Thinking Strategies*

*Indicator QEP 2.3 Number of FLC courses that implement pedagogical strategies that promote student learning of critical thinking skills.*

### Summary of Indicators:

QEP Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially Met	Target Not Met
QEP 2.1	X		
QEP 2.2			X
QEP 2.3			X

### Conclusions:

QEP Objective 2 is being partially met.

**Indicator QEP 2.1 - Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)**

	2006-2007	
	FLC Faculty	All Faculty
Analyzing	72.4%	65.3%
Synthesizing	68.9%	57.7%
Making judgments	55.2%	49.9%
Applying theories	48.3%	54.1%
Using Information	62.1%	58.6%

Comments:

1. Target met.
2. FLC member's course work emphasizes critical thinking categories when compared to medium colleges.

---



---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---



---

Recommended Target:

Lee College Faculty Learning Community members' coursework emphases will equal or exceed the "all faculty" averages for percentages of "Quite a Bit" and "Very Much" in each of the following critical thinking categories for medium colleges:

- Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory
  - Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways
  - Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods
  - Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new solutions
  - Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill
- 
-



*Indicator QEP 2.2 - Number of FLC courses designed with Critical Thinking Strategies*

	<b>Fall 2008</b>
No. of courses designed	6
No. of courses reviewed	6

## Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. 10 courses, representing FLC members' courses, were reviewed fall 2006 and 10 courses were designed to include pedagogical strategies promoting student learning of critical thinking fall 2006

---



---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---



---

Recommended Target:

1. Each cycle the FLCs will design at least ten courses that include pedagogical strategies that promote student learning of critical thinking skills.
  2. Each cycle the FLCs will review a curriculum of at least ten courses that include pedagogical strategies promoting student learning of critical thinking skills.
- 
-

***Indicator QEP 2.3 - Number of FLC courses that implement pedagogical strategies that promote student learning of critical thinking skills.***

	Fall 2008
No. of courses with implemented strategies	6
No. of courses with portfolios submitted with strategies	6

Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. 10 FLC courses were implemented utilizing pedagogical strategies that promote student learning of critical thinking skills.
3. 10 FLC portfolios were submitted to the QEP Assessment Committee. Portfolios will be kept in the QEP Resource room in the library.

---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---

Recommended Target:

1. Each cycle the FLCs will implement pedagogical strategies that promote student learning critical thinking skills in at least eight courses.
  2. Each cycle for at least eight courses, the FLCs will submit to the QEP Assessment Committee portfolios that reflect pedagogical strategies that promote student learning of critical thinking skills.
-

of

## Indicators of Effectiveness for QEP Objective 3

**QEP Objective 3. Lee College will utilize active learning methodologies.**

*Indicator QEP 3.1 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)*

*Indicator QEP 3.2 Number of FLC courses designed with Active Learning Strategies*

*Indicator QEP 3.3 Number of FLC courses that implement pedagogical strategies that promote active learning.*

### Summary of Indicators:

QEP Indicator	Target Met	Target Partially Met	Target Not Met
QEP 3.1		X	
QEP 3.2			X
QEP 3.3			X

### Conclusions:

QEP Objective 3 is being partially met.

**Indicator QEP 3.1 - Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)**

	2006-2007		
	FLC Students	All Medium Colleges/Faculty	All LC
Benchmark Score for active and collaborative learning	48.2	50.0	51.4

	FLC	All Medium Colleges	All LC
Asked questions	44.8%	64.2%	67.2%
Class presentation	44.8%	27.8%	26.2%
Worked outside of classroom	14.3%	20.1%	20.6%
Tutored	3.5%	6.2%	9.6%
Community Project	6.9%	6.0%	6.1%
Discussed ideas from classes	20.7%	14.8%	15.0%

**Comments:**

1. Target was partially met.
2. Lee College did not exceed the “all colleges” benchmark score summary data for active and collaborative learning at medium colleges.
3. As assessed by LC students the FLC members did not equal or exceed the “all faculty” averages for percentages of “Often” and “Very Often” in each of the active and collaborative learning categories for medium colleges.

---



---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---



---

**Recommended Target:**

1. Lee College students will exceed the “all colleges” benchmark score summary data for **active and collaborative** learning at medium colleges.
2. Lee College Faculty Learning Community members will equal or exceed the “all faculty” averages for percentages of “Often” plus “Very Often” in each of the following **active and collaborative** learning categories for medium colleges:

**Students:**

- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
- Made a class presentation
- Worked with class mates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)
- Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course

- Discussed ideas from readings or classes with others outside of class
- 
-

*Indicator QEP 3.2 - Number of FLC courses designed with Active Learning Strategies*

	<b>Fall 2008</b>
No. of courses designed	6
No. of courses reviewed	6

## Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. Each FLC member (10) designed a course which included specific pedagogical strategies that promote active learning.
3. Each FLC member (10) reviewed a curriculum for a course which included specific pedagogical strategies that promote active learning.

---



---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---



---

## Recommended Target:

1. Each year the FLCs will design at least 10 courses which include specific pedagogical strategies that promote active learning.
  2. Each year the FLCs will review a curriculum of at least 10 courses which include specific pedagogical strategies that promote active learning.
- 
-



***Indicator QEP 3.3 - Number of FLC courses that implement pedagogical strategies that promote active learning***

	<b>Fall 2008</b>
No. of courses with implemented strategies	6
No. of courses with portfolios submitted with strategies	6

Comments:

1. Target was not met.
2. Data does not include HCLC.
3. 10 FLC classes implemented strategies that promoted student active learning skills.
4. 10 FLC classes submitted portfolios that reflected pedagogical strategies that promoted active learning.

---

Source: QEP Assessment Committee

---

Recommended Target:

1. Each year the FLCs will implement pedagogical strategies that promote student active learning skills of at least eight courses.
  2. Each year for at least eight courses, the FLCs will submit to the QEP Assessment Committee portfolios that reflect pedagogical strategies that promote active learning.
-