

# LACCD District Planning Committee

## Minutes

May 2, 2007

### Review of Minutes of 3/28/07 DPC Meeting

The minutes of the DPC meeting of 3/28/07 were not reviewed. They will be reviewed at the next meeting.

### Review of College Strategic Planning and Ed Master Planning Calendars

Committee members reviewed two comprehensive calendars for the strategic and educational master planning efforts of all district colleges. As of this meeting, the planning cycles of eight of nine district colleges were reflected in the comprehensive planning calendars. These will be updated over coming months.

### DPC Role in Review of College Strategic and Ed Master Plans

The committee discussed the role that the DPC should play in reviewing college strategic and educational master plans. In general, it was agreed that, in keeping the principle of district decentralization, the DPC will not review plans to “approve” them, but will support the colleges and assist them in linking their planning efforts with the District Strategic Plan and will also help the colleges by establishing a “template” of best practices relating to the purposes and contents of college SPs and EMPs. It was further agreed that colleges will bring their SPs and EMPs to the DPC for review prior to formal adoption at the college level, if possible, so that the DPC’s feedback can inform the college planning process. The DPC’s feedback will be presented to each college in the form of a brief report summarizing the committee’s discussion and observations. Following DPC review, college SPs and EMPs will be presented to the BOT Committee on Planning and Student Success. Finally, it was agreed that while colleges may want to synchronize their planning cycles with the cycle of the District Strategic Plan (due for revision by 2012), they will not be required to do so.

### Core Indicators and Strategic Measures of Institutional Effectiveness

The committee reviewed and began revisions of the draft “Core Indicators and Strategic Measures” of Institutional Effectiveness. During the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

- That one primary purpose of having core indicators is to provide decision makers and the public at large with an “at-a-glance” indication of college and district “institutional health”
- That, in addition, the aim should be to create a permanent “system” of district and college accountability that provides the kind of institutional effectiveness data needed for all major district and college planning processes, including strategic planning, educational master planning, and program review
- That it would be more accurate to rename the “Strategic Measures” “In-depth Measures” of IE, and that these should provide a more fine-grained analysis of college, departmental and programmatic effectiveness all the way down to the course level
- That we need to define as few core indicators as possible if they are to be genuinely useful
- That to measure access, we should focus on unduplicated headcount, and not total enrollments or FTES measures. Instead, FTES should be viewed as a measure of institutional efficiency related to goals 4 & 5
- That while we may want the core measures of access to include the total non-credit headcount, there is no reason to disaggregate “Tier 1” non-credit from regular non-credit
- That all access headcount measures should be for fall term only
- That we should include a core indicator for the AB 1417 composite “success” rate, which would total all certificates, degrees, and transfers
- That the measures aligned with Strategic goals 4 & 5 are more accurately called measures of “Institutional Efficiency” and not “Institutional Effectiveness”
- That measures of “program efficiency” should distinguish between types of programs, including general education and vocational

### Next Meeting and Assignments

It was agreed to review the draft WLAC Educational Master Plan at the next DPC meeting on Wednesday, June 6<sup>th</sup>.