

## LACCD District Planning Committee

### Minutes

January 23, 2008

#### Review of Minutes of 12-5-07 DPC Meeting

The minutes of the DPC meeting of 12-5-07 were approved.

#### Introductions

The group members introduced themselves. Vice Chancellor Marvin Martinez and Intern Gerald Napoles were welcomed by the group.

#### Joint Board Meeting

It was announced that LACCD and the LAUSD will hold a joint board meeting on Thursday, January 24, 2008 at Los Angeles Valley College. The board members will read and are expected to approve a joint board resolution aimed at improving access to community college.

#### Ed Master Plan Update

The colleges have reported that they continue to work on their education master plan updates. Some colleges have hired consultants to assist them with the plans.

G. Colombo discussed the CCBenefits training session scheduled for next Tuesday at Los Angeles Trade-Technical College. CCBenefits EMSI is a program that can be used to create reports for environmental scan and workforce projections based on zip codes and other factors. Colleges can use the program to supply data crucial for program development. At this time, each college will be allocated 5 accounts.

Discussion next turned to the enrollment projections that G. Prather presented at the District Research Council meeting. His projections of new and returning students were based on an assumed 1% growth and were not based on declining LAUSD enrollments. In general, these data indicate that college enrollment will remain relatively level across the district for the next five years. Since the last bond election, the District Office of Research has predicted flat growth. Given these projections, it is clear that if colleges are to increase access to college over coming years, they will have to make extraordinary efforts to recruit students of all ages (not just those recently graduating from LAUSD).

It was mentioned that it has been known for some time that LAUSD has not been growing and that growth for LACCD enrollments does not necessarily hinge on LAUSD's enrollment growth.

#### Program Review Template

At the last two DPC meetings, the committee has examined four program reviews. To summarize the elements in these four reviews, E. Pai created a document entitled *Program Review: College Data Element Matrix*.

G. Colombo shared this document and the program review "Guidelines" with the committee. He asked the committee for response to the data items in sections 4, 5, and 6. He said it is important to track or cite job placement though it might be difficult. During the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

It was agreed that program reviews should contain SLO assessment results at the program level and that they should also include plans for improving SLOs at this level.

It was noted that course-level SLOs should probably be assessed in relation to the Title V update process.

It was agreed that, in order to be genuinely strategic and to drive program development, program review should look at challenges and opportunities in the environment. To do this at ELAC, for example, a departmental SWOT is built into the program review process.

It was agreed that program review should document and include an analysis course scheduling patterns to guarantee that departments are offering classes on a schedule that makes it possible for students to complete certificates and degrees in a timely manner.

It was agreed that the issues currently listed under the heading of “Program Integrity” might also be titled “Compliance.”

Before the next meeting, G. Colombo will work with R. Tillberg and others to revise the program review guidelines and matrices. A new draft will be brought to the DPC at its next meeting.

### **Process for Board Review of College and DO Progress on District Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives**

The group next discussed how the colleges would comply with the Board’s recent call for regular reports on college progress toward achieving the goals and objectives in the District Strategic Plan. G. Colombo provided the committee with copies of the Board’s goals for 2008, which contain this requirement and a draft “Report Card” document that could be used to facilitate these reports to the board.

During the ensuing discussion, a number of concerns were raised. Some committee members saw this reporting requirement as yet another mandate that will overburden the colleges. Some were concerned about the implications of calling the reporting framework document a “report card” and were also concerned about establishing the expectation that all colleges would respond to the goals and objectives in the District Strategic Plan in the same way.

In general, the following points were made:

- That colleges would be best served if they reported individually to the Board Committee on Planning and Student Success
- That such reports should provide the occasion for open and serious dialogue between the Board and college administrative and faculty leadership about college effectiveness and that they should be more than simply a another college “showcase”
- That the Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness be reviewed for each college during these sessions
- That the colleges are not necessarily expected to respond to all of the objectives in the District Strategic Plan because they may not address issues or factors that are relevant to the college’s service area
- That colleges may be expected to have goals and objectives that reflect the particular conditions of their campuses and service areas—and that do not necessarily conform to the goals and objectives of the District Strategic Plan
- That, however, the colleges should clearly be engaged in some serious concrete response to the overall goals and objectives in the District Strategic Plan, particularly since they have agreed to align their college goals and objective with those of the district and because the district goals and objectives are the only ones that have been formally adopted by the Board of Trustees
- That it may still be valuable for the colleges to have a relatively standard “framework” or baseline document and perhaps even a “rubric” for measuring their progress toward achieving DSP goals
- That any such reporting to the Board should not be undertaken hastily, that it should be carefully planned in advance, and that any approach should be piloted within the DPC this spring to determine its value

It was agreed that the “report card” would be re-named the “framework” or “guide” for reporting college progress on the DSP and that G. Colombo would bring a revision to the next meeting of the DPC for additional discussion.

### **Amendment to District Strategic Plan: Workforce Development**

The committee agreed to table the project of thoroughly revising the goals and objectives of the DSP because, after consultation with District Counsel, it has become clear that any amendment to the DSP would require formal Board review and action. Instead, the DPC will consider limited amendments to the plan relating to workforce development and financial aid.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, February 6, 2008 in the LACCD Board Room.