

# LACCD District Planning Committee

## Minutes

December 5, 2007

### Review of Minutes of 10/24/07 DPC Meeting

The minutes of the DPC meeting of 10/24/07 were reviewed and approved with minor revisions.

### Ed Master Plan Update Update

Pierce: Pierce has brought in a consultant to work with faculty and staff to develop a formal strategic plan in support of future capital projects. This plan will contain the college's new educational planning goals and notation of emerging programs and is expected in early spring term.

LACC: City's Educational Planning Committee is engaged in updating its EMP. The final update is expected in early spring. It will contain an environmental scan and will involve extensive consultation and several open forums.

LASC: Southwest has engaged a consultant to organize its EMP revision process, and most academic and support units are already actively engaged in planning. A draft EMP update is expected in early spring.

LAHC: Harbor reports that it will be holding its first EMP update meeting later today.

LATTC & CCBenefits: Copies of sample pages from the draft LATTC EMP were distributed and reviewed by the committee as an example of what can be done with the CCBenefits EMSI planning tool. Both Ed Pai and LATTC VP Marcy Drummond report that the EMSI system is easy to use and that it promises valuable external data for EMP purposes. The District will be purchasing the modules for the EMSI program and will organize a district-wide training session on its use for sometime in January.

The committee agreed that the target date for completion of the updates of college EMP goals and objectives will be April 1, 2008.

### Survey of Program Review Best Practices

Dan Walden presented Southwest's web-based program review process. PR is organized at LASC around a two-week "marathon," involving all departments and units. No regular college meetings are scheduled during this time. Since adopting this approach, Southwest has been able to complete PRs for 36 departments (100%) as compared to only 3 in past rounds of PR. The process at LASC also involves follow-up review by the Academic Senate. It is structured to offer "seamless" integration of PR and college planning & budgeting. The challenges that LASC still faces in relation to PR involve increasing faculty/chair participation, improved data collection, and sustaining its web-based delivery. Currently, faculty are paid to complete program review modules.

Maury Peal next presented LAMC's approach to web-based PR. Responding to concerns raised by accreditors about the integration of PR and college-wide budget planning, Mission has relied on the models at LASC and WLAC in designing its PR system. "Unit Assessment," as PR is called at Mission, involves three components: "Effectiveness Review," "Curriculum Review," and "SLO Review." Data for Mission's PR is derived from the Student Information System and local college files, and does not offer drill-down capability. A formal validation follow-up process is involved as at Southwest.

During the ensuing discussion the need for more objective input into PR was noted as a future priority. It was also noted that LATTC is currently working on its own "home-grown" web-based PR system.

### **Program Review Guidelines**

Next, the committee turned its attention to the draft “Guidelines for Program Review.” During this preliminary discussion, questions were raised about the need to include SLO assessment data in departmental reviews. It was noted that the ACCJC “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness” suggests that SLOs be integrated into on-going PR processes, and, in addition, that SLO “assessment reports” be used on a regular basis for program improvement. However, the question of whether SLO “assessment reports” are separate from PR remains unclear. The committee agreed to send the PR “Guidelines” to the District Research Council for discussion and input and then to return to the topic at the next DPC meeting.

### **District Strategic Plan Revision**

The committee initiated its formal review of the goals and objectives in the District Strategic Plan. Gary Colombo explained that it would make sense to revise some of the DSP’s language at this point, because some of the current wording reflects issues and initiatives that were very specific to the time of the plan’s composition. It was also suggested that the original plan does not reflect priorities that have emerged since its composition—things like increasing workforce development, the development of programs in line with emerging technologies, and the need to increase awareness of financial aid resources. G. Colombo presented committee members with a series of recommended revisions to the goals and objects for their consideration.

However, it was noted early on in the committee’s discussion of the issue that some of the recommended revisions actually appear to shift the meaning of the plan’s original objectives. For example, substituting “K-14 Partnership Initiative” in Objective 1.1 for “College Access Initiative” substantially limits the scope of the objective.

The committee agreed to distribute the proposed revisions electronically and to return to the task of DSP revision at its next meeting.

### **Next Meeting**

It was agreed to meet next on Wednesday, January 23, 2008.