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The Strategic Planning Process

The KCCD Strategic Plan describes the priorities for the District in a process to ensure the priorities are well thought out, clearly understood, and achievable. The process involves multiple phases, each informing the others. The first phase is a district-wide strategic plan which provides general direction and an overarching framework. It includes district-wide Goals and Objectives. Common measures under each objective are also identified as a means of gauging how the District and the Colleges meet each objective.

A second phase includes college-wide strategic plans which build upon the Goals and Objectives agreed upon in the district-wide plan by providing more specificity including Strategies and Action Plans. Discussion between the college presidents and chancellor will finalize specific college targets.

In the final phase, the Strategies will be brought back to the district-wide plan in order to provide a complete district-wide plan which includes goals, measurable objectives and strategies. This multiple-phase process allows each college to identify strategies and develop action plans based on their unique circumstances and student needs, while still focusing on district-wide goals and objectives.

The first year of this new process (2014-15) will be one of development culminating in a complete district-wide strategic plan including specific district office and college strategies. Year Two (2015-16) will start an annual process of review, evaluation and adjustment.

Each fall, the district-wide strategic planning committee and the college strategic planning committees will review the progress made on the objectives and evaluate how well the strategies and action plans have worked. Adjustments or new strategies will be incorporated as needed in order to continue progress toward the Goals and Objectives. Year five (2018-19) would reboot the process in order to re-evaluate the Mission, Vision, Values, or Goals.
The Strategic Planning Process

Districtwide Strategic Plan Process

**YEAR ONE**
2014/15

Phase 1 – Fall
Districtwide Strategic Plan Framework
Review and Update the Districtwide Mission, Vision, Values, High Level Goals and Key Objectives
Districtwide Group of College and District Office Representatives

Phase 2 – Spring
College/District Strategic Plans
Colleges update their Mission, Vision, Values
College/District Representatives

Phase 3 – Spring/Summer
Discussion
Review College/District Objectives, Strategies, Action Plans and Targets with the intent to Fold College Objectives and Strategies into the Districtwide Plan to add Specificity
Chancellor, Presidents, Board, etc.

Phase 4 – Spring/Summer
Complete Districtwide Strategic Plan

**YEAR TWO, THREE AND FOUR**
2015/16 – 2017/18

Phase 1 – Fall
Annual Review of College/District Plans
Review Outcomes and Reassess Objectives, Strategies, Action Plans, Targets, and Overall Direction
College/District Representatives

Phase 2 – Spring
Discussion
Review Findings and any need for Direction Changes
Chancellor, Presidents, Board, etc.

Phase 3 – Spring/Summer
Annual Districtwide Strategic Plan Update Report
Include Data and Narrative about Progress and any Adjustments

**YEAR FIVE**
2018/19

Start Process Over – Fall
Review and Update the Districtwide Mission, Vision, Values, High Level Goals and Key Objectives
Include Assessment of Annual Updates for Trends and Necessary Adjustments
Districtwide Group of College and District Office Representatives

Data Informed Process
- Objectives are Measurable
- Objectives include Action Plans
- Consistent Data and Measures are Used
- Annual Districtwide Scorecard or Comprehensive Reporting to Support Process (see proposed model)

Process and Discussions Inform:
- Annual Evaluations
  - Board and Chancellor
  - Chancellor and Presidents
  - Chancellor and District Office Personnel
  - Presidents and College Personnel
- Budget Decisions
- Hiring Decisions
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OUR COMMUNITY

Race and Ethnicity
Per the US Census Bureau, the 2013 KCCD service area population was 53.2% Hispanic. The Hispanic population is projected to grow to 57.0% by 2018.

Bakersfield College
Population By Race
2013 Estimate

The 2013 BC service area population was 55.5% Hispanic and 32.5% White. By 2018, the Hispanic population is expected to increase to 59.4%, and the overall minority population is projected to be 67.4%.

Cerro Coso Community College
Population By Race
2013 Estimate

The 2013 CC service area population was 22.6% Hispanic and 64.2% White. By 2018, the Hispanic population is expected to increase to 25.4%, and the overall minority population is projected to be 39.5%.

Porterville College
Population By Race
2013 Estimate

The 2013 PC service area population was 66.6% Hispanic and 26.5% White. By 2018, the Hispanic population is expected to increase to 70.0%, and the overall minority population is projected to be 76.9%.

Source: 2013 ESRI BA Data Set
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Income and Poverty

- In the BC service area, an estimated 17.9% of families live below the poverty level ($23,550 for a family of four). Female head of household families have a significantly higher rate of poverty (43.2%), than married couple families (13.1%). BC’s service area median household income was slightly over $49,000 in 2013 and is projected to increase 11.6% by 2018.

- In the CC service area, an estimated 12.0% of families live below the poverty level ($23,550 for a family of four). Female head of household families have a significantly higher rate of poverty (48.5%), than that of married couple families (8.4%). CC’s service area median household income was slightly lower than $37,500 in 2013 and is projected to increase 11.5% by 2018.

- In the PC service area, an estimated 25.9% of families live below the poverty level ($23,550 for a family of four). Female head of household families have a much higher rate of poverty (44.9%), than that of married families (23.3%). PC’s service area median household income was slightly lower than $45,000 in 2013 and is projected to increase 10.1% by 2018.

Income Below Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KCCD</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Families</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couples</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families w/ Female Householder*</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All People</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No husband present

Source: American Community Survey 2008-2012 (5-Yr. Est.)
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Unemployment Status

Unemployment is reported by the California Department of Finance by county. The four major counties within the service area (Kern, Inyo, Mono, and Tulare) have experienced a similar pattern of unemployment over 10 years. Unemployment was typically highest in 2010 and has declined since.

- Unemployment in Kern County has varied from a low of 7.5% in 2006 to a high of 15.9% in 2010. In the latest complete year (2013), it was 11.8%.
- Unemployment in Inyo County has varied from a low of 4.6% in 2006 to a high of 10.1% in 2010. In the latest complete year (2013), it was 8.1%.
- Unemployment in Mono County has varied from a low of 4.4% in 2006 to a high of 10.7% in 2012. In the latest complete year (2013), it was 8.6%.
- Unemployment in Tulare County has varied from a low of 9.2% in 2006 to a high of 17.0% in 2010. In the latest complete year (2013), it was 14.0%.

Unemployment Rate Trend by County

Source: CA Department of Finance
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OUR STUDENTS

Headcount

The first chart below shows the headcount for each college for Fall 2009 and Fall 2013. In general, the KCCD headcount declined in that time period with Cerro Coso experiencing the largest decrease (27%).

The second chart shows incoming students as a percentage of the total student population for each college for Fall 2009 and Fall 2013. A student is considered incoming if their first term enrolled at KCCD equals the specified fall term or the previous summer term. While incoming students constitute a higher percentage of CC and PC’s student body in 2013 compared to 2009, incoming students constitute a lower percentage of BC’s student body in 2013 compared to 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>18,690</td>
<td>18,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>28,884</td>
<td>26,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td>17,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity

The majority of students at BC and PC are Hispanic/Latino. The majority of students at CC are White, with Hispanic/Latino being the second largest population.

All three colleges experienced an increase in the percent of Hispanic/Latino students over the past 5 years and a corresponding decrease in White students. The race and ethnicity of incoming students is similar to that of all students.

Bakersfield College — Population By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Students 18,296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cerro Coso Community College — Population By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Students 4,641</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Porterville College — Population By Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Students 3,903</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OUR STUDENTS

Incoming Student Placement

This section details placement information for incoming students who completed assessment testing. The chart below displays the number of areas (English, Math, and Reading) in which a student needed remediation, among incoming students who completed at least one assessment.

Of all Fall 2013 incoming students who completed at least one assessment test:

- 81% of BC's incoming students needed remediation
- 72% of CC's incoming students needed remediation
- 91% of PC's incoming students needed remediation

Number of Areas in Which a Student Needed Remediation

Among Incoming Students Who Completed At Least One Assessment — Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BC (n=3,887)</th>
<th>CC (n=687)</th>
<th>PC (n=704)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 areas remedial</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 areas remedial</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 areas remedial</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No remediation</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Students Not Assessed

- BC: 12%
- CC: 45%
- PC: 27%

Another metric of interest is the percentage of incoming students who did not complete any assessment testing. At BC, the percentage of students not completing assessment has been decreasing over the past five years to only 12% of Fall 2013 incoming students. CC has also experienced a decrease, but with just under half of their incoming students not completing assessment in Fall 2013. PC has experienced a slight increase in the percentage of students not completing assessment over the past five years with just over a quarter of their incoming students not completing assessment.
Awards
The table below shows the number of awards earned at each college over five years. Of the three colleges, Cerro Coso has had the largest increase in awards (65%), which is mostly from Certificates of Achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>5-year % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bakersfield College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-T/AS-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Achievement</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills Certificates</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cerro Coso Community College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-T/AS-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Achievement</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>192%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills Certificates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porterville College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-T/AS-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Achievement</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills Certificates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transfers
The following table shows the number of transfers at each college over five years.

After a spike in 2010-11, all three colleges have experienced a decline in transfers. A similar trend exists at the statewide level as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>5-year % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Private</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerro Coso Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Private</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State Private</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfers</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSU and UC transfer numbers are from the CSU and UC system offices, while ISP and OOS numbers are from the CCCCO DataMart.

Looking at the most recent transfer year, the majority of BC's transfer students attended a CSU. PC has a similar dynamic; however, a quarter of their transfer students attended an in-state private college. Almost half of CC's transfer students attended college located out-of-state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013-13 Transfers by Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student Success Scorecard Results

This section includes the most recent Student Success Scorecard results as reported by the California Community College Chancellor's Office. This information is updated annually as part of the state’s Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC). There are five measures - Completion, Persistence, 30 Unit Attainment, Progress through Remediation, and Career Technical Education Completion. Each measure defines a cohort of students who are tracked for a specific amount of time (generally six years) to determine whether they succeed in the metric. The tables in this section have results for the last five cohorts in each measure.

Bakersfield College

BC results have generally declined in the five-year time period. The only positive trend was for the Remedial Math rate which increased from 20.2% in 2003-04 to 21.4% in 2007-08. Although there was a slight variation between cohort years, the trend for the Remedial English rate remained the same during the five-year period. All other rates declined in the five-year time period.

When compared to statewide rates, BC results tend to be lower. There were a few exceptions where BC student results were above the statewide rate such as Persistence (both the Overall and Unprepared Students), 30 Unit Attainment (Prepared Students), and Remedial ESL. The metrics with the lowest results compared to statewide were Completion, Remedial English and Math, and Career Technical Education. When compared to the highest score in the Peer Group (which is only reported for the Overall Completion rate), BC's results were lower - 39.9% compared to 50.5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bakersfield College</th>
<th>Trend for the Most Recent Five Cohorts</th>
<th>2007-08 Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared (avg 16% of cohort)</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unprepared (avg 84% of cohort)</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared (avg 16% of cohort)</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unprepared (avg 84% of cohort)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Units</td>
<td>Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared (avg 16% of cohort)</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unprepared (avg 84% of cohort)</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial English</td>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Math</td>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial ESL</td>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A Peer Group Comparison is only available for the Overall Completion metric. This peer group is comprised of 19 colleges (avg score = 41.3%).
Cerro Coso Community College

Results within the five-year trend at CC are generally positive. The only measure with a downward trend was Career Technical Education - which declined by 9 percentage points during the time period. Measures with the highest increases were Completion (both Overall and Prepared Students), 30 Units Attained (both Overall and Unprepared Students), and Remedial Math.

When compared to statewide rates, CC results tend to be lower. An exception was Completion where rates for both the Overall and Prepared Students were above the statewide rate. The metrics with the lowest results compared to statewide were 30 Unit Attainment, Remedial English and Math, and Career Technical Education. When compared to the highest score in the Peer Group (which is only reported for the Overall Completion rate), CC’s results were lower - 49.8% compared to 58.6%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Coso Community College</th>
<th>Trend for the Most Recent Five Cohorts</th>
<th>2007-08 Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Scorecard Metrics</td>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>2004/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared (avg 25% of cohort)</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared (avg 75% of cohort)</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared (avg 25% of cohort)</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared (avg 75% of cohort)</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared (avg 25% of cohort)</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared (avg 75% of cohort)</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A Peer Group Comparison is only available for the Overall Completion metric. This peer group is comprised of 15 colleges (avg score = 48.6%).
Porterville College

Results within the five-year trend at PC are generally positive. The only downward trends were for prepared students attaining 30 Units and for Remedial ESL (note the small cohort size). Measures with the highest increases were Completion (Overall), Remedial English, and Remedial Math.

When compared to statewide rates, many PC results were higher. For example, all three rates for Persistence were higher than statewide rates. All three rates for 30 Unit Attainment were also above statewide but by a closer margin. While Remedial ESL was one of the rates that declined in the five-year trend, the 2007-08 rate was still over the statewide rate. Results in the Career Technical Education measure were also above the statewide rate. The metrics with the lowest results compared to statewide were Remedial English and Remedial Math. When compared to the highest score in the Peer Group (which is only reported for the Overall Completion rate), PC's results were lower - 45.2% compared to 50.5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion - Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre pared (avg 11% of cohort)</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared (avg 89% of cohort)</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence - Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre pared (avg 11% of cohort)</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared (avg 89% of cohort)</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Units - Overall Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre pared (avg 11% of cohort)</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared (avg 89% of cohort)</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial English - Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Math - Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial ESL - Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education - Outcome Success Rate</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Peer Group Comparison is only available for the Overall Completion metric. This peer group is comprised of 19 colleges (avg score = 41.9%).
KCCD Guiding Principles

Vision

Our Vision is that the Kern Community College District is recognized as an exemplary educational leader, partnering with our communities to develop potential and create opportunities. Successful students will strengthen their communities and, along with the faculty and staff, become life-long learners.

Values

Invested  We are invested in our students by assisting them to achieve informed educational goals.

Inclusive  We foster an inclusive learning environment that celebrates the diversity of people, ideas and learning styles.

Accountable  We promote a climate of trust and accountability through the open sharing of ideas and information.

Focused  We are focused to strive for and meet the highest standards of performance in everything we do.

Committed  We are committed to recruiting and retaining the best employees.

Mission

The mission of the Kern Community College District is to provide outstanding educational programs and services that are responsive to our diverse students and communities.

To accomplish this mission, we will:

- Provide academic instruction to promote fulfillment of four-year college transfer requirements and encourage degree and/or certificate acquisition in our surrounding communities.
- Provide workforce skills training through Career and Technical Education programs.
- Provide basic skills education and student services programs to enable students to become successful learners.
- Establish partnerships with businesses and governmental entities as well as other educational institutions to advance economic development
- Improve the quality of life of our students and communities through broad-based general education courses.
- Prepare students with the skills to function effectively in the global economy of the 21st century.
- Anticipate and prepare to meet challenges by continually assessing and prioritizing programs, services, and community needs.
Strategic Goals and Objectives

**Strategic Goal #1: Maximize Student Success**

- **Increase Completion**
  *Common Measures:*
  - Annual number of transfers
  - Annual transfer rate
  - Annual number of degrees and certificates
  - Annual course success and retention
  - Student Success Scorecard Completion Rate

- **Improve Milestone Achievements**
  *Common Measures:*
  - Annual rate of students completing all matriculation components
  - Annual rate of students completing a student education plan
  - Annual rate of students completing 12 units in their first term
  - Annual rate of students completing 30 units in their first year
  - Student Success Scorecard 30-Unit rate
  - Student Success Scorecard Persistence rate
  - Student Success Scorecard Remedial English Progress Rate
  - Student Success Scorecard Remedial Math Progress Rate

- **Increase Student Engagement**
  *Common Measures:*
  - Annual rate of students completing orientation
  - CCSSE key findings for Active and Collaborative Learning, Student Effort, Academic Challenge, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Support for Learners
  - Number of students in clubs and organizations.
Strategic Goals and Objectives

Strategic Goal #2: Implement Student Equity Measures

- Close Achievement Gaps
  Common Measures:
  - Disaggregated data for the common measures in Goal #1 provided by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

Strategic Goal #3: Ensure Student Access

- Optimize Student Enrollment
  Common Measures:
  - Annual FTES
  - Annual productivity
  - Waitlisted enrollments on first day
  - Number of dual and concurrent enrollments

- Be the Higher Education Option of First Choice
  Common Measures:
  - Enrollment yield from feeder high schools
  - Participation rate (disaggregated)
Strategic Goals and Objectives

Strategic Goal #4: Enhance Community Connections

Provide Workforce and Economic Development Programs that Respond to Local Industry

Common Measures:
- Annual number of CTE degrees and certificates
- Annual rate of CTE programs meeting core indicator performance goals
- Annual number of contract education contracts, hours and students served
- Student Success Scorecard CTE Completion rate

Reflect the Communities We Serve

Common Measures:
- Percentage of employees who attend community meetings
- Degree to which employee diversity reflects the service area population
- Degree to which employee diversity reflects the student population
- Degree to which there is diversity in the employment applicant pool

Strategic Goal #5: Strengthen Organizational Effectiveness

Provide Effective Professional Development

Common Measures:
- Percentage of employees who feel they have adequate training
- Percentage of employees who feel there are opportunities to learn and grow
- Percentage of employees who feel encouraged and supported
- Percentage of positions hired through internal promotion
Strategic Goals and Objectives

- **Meet and Exceed Internal and External Standards and Requirements**
  *Common Measures:*
  - Percentage of ACCJC institutional set standards met
  - Percentage of courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes
  - Percentage of programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes
  - Percentage of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment
  - Percentage of academic expenditures in the numerator
  - Full-time to part-time faculty ratio
  - Percentage of Reserves

- **Increase Trust and Create a Collaborative Culture**
  *Common Measures:*
  - Percentage of employees reporting trust between site locations
  - Percentage of employees reporting trust between employee groups
  - Percentage of employees who report positive interactions
  - Percentage of employees who believe their work environment is open to diverse ideas
  - Percentage of employees who feel consulted and listened to
  - Percentage of employees who feel there is a satisfactory level of communication
  - Percentage of employees who attend department and committee meetings

- **Improve Facilities and Maintenance**
  *Common Measures:*
  - Percentage of employees who feel the facilities are adequately maintained
  - Number of work orders submitted for building maintenance, custodial and grounds and the percentage completed
  - Percentage of employees who feel the workplace is attractive
  - Percentage of employees who feel their work location is clean
  - Number of safety and security incidents reported
  - Percentage of employees who feel safe at their location
  - Percentage of employees who feel their work environment is conducive to productivity