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The Los Angeles Trade-Technical College Strategic Educational Master Plan, \textit{Student Success Through Innovation (SEMP) - 2014-2017}, merges and builds on the 2012-2015 Strategic Master (SMP) and Educational Master Plans (EMP) and focuses on what the College plans to accomplish by 2017.

The plan was developed in compliance with Title 5 regulations. The purpose of the plan is to outline the College’s vision, mission, values, and strategic priorities. The underlying strategy behind the plan is the Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) Framework. The College’s commitment and work up to today to implement PACTS has led us to recommit ourselves to the continued implementation of this ambitious plan with a few refinements. Thus, the 2012-2015 SMP and EMP have been combined into one document and updated, building on progress to date and extending the timeline for completion through 2017.

The plan contains goals, actions, and evaluation measures. The plan goals are:

- To develop strategies for planning and decision-making that engage the entire college community and ensure that its direction is shaped by the future learning needs of the community the college serves.
- To provide the direction and parameters for designing and implementing programs and activities.

LATTC has established five strategic priorities with innovative changes to enhance student success. The College is committed to transforming the student experience through curriculum innovation and the PACTS implementation. This transformation will incorporate the appropriate Student Support Services, Faculty and Staff Development activities and adequate Funding while enhancing the Campus Experience and Culture. The plan’s “big picture” strategies are catalysts for ongoing innovation, and change.

Development of the 2012-2015 plan was a yearlong process. It included review of the mission, vision statements, and core values; as well as development, implementation of the College’s strategic priorities and action plans. The process also ensured that the plan was integrated with other college plans and the District Strategic Plan.

The process for developing the plan involved the following steps:

- Environmental Scan to help determine what was happening in the college environment.
- SWOC analysis – to help determine the College’s Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Challenges.
- Focus groups, Days of Dialogue and Open forum sessions to give and receive feedback about the planning process.
- Identification of strategic issues
- Survey to assess overall feelings about the strategic areas.
- Setting Strategic priorities based on feedback.
- Distribution of draft plan for feedback.

The 2012-15 SMP and EMP plans were approved by the Academic Senate (on 04/25/12) and College Council (on 04/16/12). The updated 2015-2017 SEMP plan was approved by the Academic Senate (on 6/2/2015) and by College Council (on 6/3/2015).
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ABOUT LATTC’S SEMP

• **Plan Name:** Strategic Educational Master Plan: Student Success Through Innovation (SEMP)

• **Dates covered:** 2014-2017

• **Updates and builds on progress of:** 2012-2015 SMP and EMP

• **Purpose:** to outline the College’s vision, mission, values, strategic priorities and allow LATTC to recommit to the implementation of the PACTS pathways.
PLAN GOALS

1. To develop strategies for planning and decision-making that engage the entire college community. Ensure that its direction is shaped by the future learning needs of the community the college serves.

2. To provide the direction and parameters for designing and implementing programs and activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Action Plan(s)</th>
<th>Evaluation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SP #1: LATTC Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) | • Implement the PACTS Pathways  
• Implement PACTS Tiers I and II  
• Formalize an Instructional Support Services Program tied to PACTS  
• Develop K-12-LATTC-Career Program | Attain Institutional Set-Standards  
Course Completion: 70%  
Retention Rate: 56%  
Certificate Attainment: 5.3%  
Degree Attainment: 2.7%  
Transfer: 1.3% |
| SP #2: Student Support | • Evaluate and Improve Counseling and Advisement Services  
• Make Student Service Processes “Student Focused” | 75% of new (non-exempt) students complete Assessment, Orientation, Counseling (currently at 71%) |
| SP #3: Trade Tech Experience and Campus Culture | • Improve the friendliness of the LATTC Experience and Campus  
• Improve Formal Campus Communication and Governance  
• Build a Robust LATTC Campus Culture – theme of “lifting an entire community”  
• Ensure the Facilities Master Plan and Building Priorities Support the SEMP Strategic Priorities | Improve employee satisfaction by 5% as measured in Campus Climate Survey over 2014-15 baseline |
| SP #4: Faculty and Staff Development | • Establish a LATTC Teaching Academy to Institutionalize Innovative Teaching-Learning approaches  
• Improve Information About, Access to, and Application of Faculty and Staff Development Opportunities | 75% of faculty and staff engage in professional development opportunities that align to student success efforts |
| SP #5: Funding | • Design, implement and refine the Strategic Cost Management Model with Revenue Centers  
• Identify and Implement Revenue Generating Ideas  
• Diversify LATTC’s Funding Sources by Revitalizing the Foundation | Pathway funding model developed and piloted |
PROCESS AND APPROVALS TIMELINE

• Process:
  ➢ Environmental Scan
  ➢ SWOC analysis
  ➢ Focus groups, Days of Dialogue and Open Forums
  ➢ Identification of strategic issues
  ➢ Survey to assess overall feelings about the strategic areas.
  ➢ Feedback loops
  ➢ Set up strategic priorities based on input and feedback

• Approvals:
  ➢ 2012-2015 Plans: Academic Senate (04/25/12); College Council (04/16/12)
  ➢ 2015-2017 Update: Academic Senate (06/02/15); College Council (06/03/15)
## INTEGRATION OF LACCD AND LATTC PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LACCD</th>
<th>LATTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GOAL 1: Access and Preparation for Success** | • SEMP 1 - LATTC PACTS (Tier 1 and 2)  
• ATD Priority 1- Increasing math readiness  
• Student Equity Plan  
• SSSP |
| **GOAL 2: Teaching and Learning for Success** | • SEMP 1 - LATTC PACTS (Tier 3 and 4)  
• SEMP 2 - Student Support  
• ATD Priority 2 – Increasing math completion in program of study  
• Student Equity Plan  
• SSSP |
| **GOAL 3: Organizational Effectiveness**    | • SEMP 3 – Trade Tech Experience and Campus Culture  
• SEMP 4 – Faculty and Staff Development |
| **GOAL 4: Resources and Collaboration**     | • SEMP 5 – Funding  
• SEMP 3.3 – Community Asset and Partner |
GOVERNANCE AND DECISION-MAKING

ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee
October 21, 2015
Why Assess District-Level Governance and Decision-Making?

ACCJC Standard IV.D.7

The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.
What Have We Done to Assess District-Level Governance and Decision-Making?

- Fall 2009, District Planning Committee (now DPAC) created the District-Level Governance and Decision-Making Assessment in response to recommendation from Spring 2009 Cityside self study visits
- Formal assessment conducted every two years
- Purpose of the assessment is to evaluate:
  - Representativeness of stakeholder groups in district-level decision-making
  - Quality and effectiveness of district-level decision-making and processes
  - Overall assessment of administrative and Board support of participatory governance and effectiveness of districtwide decision-making in relation to District’s stated mission
- Results of three surveys (2010, 2012, and 2014) have been compiled, analyzed, and reported to DPAC
Governance and Decision-Making Survey: Respondents

Total number of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of respondents by roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Manager</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance and Decision-Making Survey: Topics

- Representation
- Planning
- Communication
- Decision-Making Process
- Central Problems
- Suggestions for Improvement

*Questions used a 5-point Likert scale. For easier comparisons, values were combined into the following: Agree (Strongly Agree + Agree) and Disagree (Disagree + Strongly Disagree) as well as No Opinion/Do Not Know.
Survey Results: Representation

- Percentage of respondents who agreed that the following groups are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision-making:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Academic Senate</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, classified staff, and other employees</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results: Representation

- Percentage of respondents who agreed that the following groups are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision-making:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA College Faculty Guild, 1521</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFT College Staff Guild, 1521A</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Construction Trades Council</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA City and County Schools Employees Union, 99</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Employees, 721</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union, 911</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Results: Planning

- Percentage of respondents who agreed that district-level decision-making is effective in relation to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget development and resource allocation</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td><strong>39.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment management and FTES target setting</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td><strong>53.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning and strategic goal setting</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td><strong>46.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Program planning and oversight</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td><strong>28.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits (JLMBC)</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td><strong>68.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results: Communication

- Percentage of respondents who agreed that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made through participatory governance at district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td><strong>32.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is excellent resource for communication and information sharing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td><strong>21.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All 3 years, respondents said one of the most common central problems with district-level governance at LACCD has been lack of communication or transparency.
- Common suggestion for improvement was to improve communications and information dissemination related to district-level decision-making processes.
Survey Results: Decision-Making Process

- Percentage of respondents who agreed that decisions made through participatory governance at the district-level are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on research and data</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed through on effectively</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of decisions made through participatory governance at district level are assessed for effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results of decisions made through participatory governance at district level are assessed for effectiveness**</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District / college administration support participatory governance at district level</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results: Overall

- Percentage of respondents who said overall district-wide decision-making is effective in supporting the district’s mission and goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results: Central Problems

• All 3 years, respondents said the most common problems with district-level governance at LACCD have been:
  • Lack of communication or transparency
  • Issues related to the size and scope of District; BOT micromanaging
  • Insufficient representation or unbalanced participation from stakeholders
Survey Results: Suggestions for Improvement

- Most common suggestions from respondents on how to improve district-level participatory governance and decision-making:
  - Enhance professional development on district governance; encourage stakeholder participation
  - Improve communications and information dissemination related to district-level decision-making processes
  - Streamline district-level governance and planning processes; limit BOT micromanaging
Recent Feedback from the District Academic Senate Summit

• On 9/25/2015, at District Academic Senate Summit had brainstorming session on What are your ideas and strategies to improve district-wide communication?

• Most common suggestions were:
  • Create schedule for regular communication (before, during, and after decision-making)
  • Send highlights from each meeting
  • Use agenda to organize meeting minutes; include action items
  • Prioritize information to be shared based on group
  • Use alternative methods for sharing information
Looking Forward

• The process and surveys for governance assessments (which include annual committee assessments as well as the Governance and Decision-Making Survey) are being reviewed by DPAC

• Annual committee assessments and the biennial Governance and Decision-Making Survey results will be integrated and included in the District’s Institutional Effectiveness reporting cycle

• Communication suggestions from the DAS Summit will be studied for feasibility and effectiveness by EPIE and DPAC
Questions
Executive Summary

The LACCD has established district-level integrated processes for strategic, financial, facilities, and technology planning. College-District planning is integrated within each domain and there are inter-relationships among these domains, as shown in Figure 1 below. These processes provide a coherent framework for district-college planning and integration with the goal of promoting student learning and achievement.

Figure 1: Planning Integration

1. District Strategic Planning

The District Strategic Plan (DSP), Vision 2017, is the principal framework for integration of college and district-level planning. College strategic plans are integrated with the District Strategic Plan (DSP), Vision 2017, through alignment of goals between the two. In the LACCD, colleges are directly responsible for establishing their own strategic goals and objectives in response to the educational, workforce, and cultural needs of the communities they serve. The DSP created a framework for district-wide integration of college-level activities and initiatives. The structure of the DSP allows colleges to maintain autonomy and responsibility for implementing the goals and objectives of the District plan, based on their local conditions and institutional priorities.

2. District-Level Financial Planning

As part of the annual district-wide financial planning process, the colleges and District jointly establish district-wide FTES targets for the academic year. These targets, which incorporate college and district-level enrollment projections, are reviewed by the Chancellor’s Cabinet, District Budget Committee, and the Board’s Budget and Finance Committee. The district’s Budget Allocation Model utilizes these FTES projections and additional revenue streams to determine each college’s allocation and funding for ESC centralized services. As the year progresses, both the colleges and the District monitor revenue and expenditure projections, update financial plans, and review budgets and FTES growth targets.
3. District-Level Facilities Planning

The Division of Facilities Planning and Development (FPD) is responsible for long-term planning, management, and oversight of capital improvement and bond projects and for developing creative, cost-effective solutions to facility challenges. FPD staff work collaboratively with college administrators to define and implement the types of facilities projects that should be pursued, their size and scope, when they should be changed, the type and cost of facilities projects, and how facilities projects should be funded. Recommendations on district-wide real estate, capital, and bond-related policies and projects are formulated by the Division of Facilities Planning and Development in consultation with local college constituencies and are formally consulted via the Facilities Master Planning and Oversight Committee (FMPOC).

4. District-Level Technology Planning

Since 2009, LACCD has engaged in an effort to accelerate the development of Districtwide minimum standards for infrastructure, cabling, data center location, sizing and environments for technology support. Standards for applications, web portals, and smart classrooms have also been developed, with flexibility of products to meet the needs of each situation and college. The District Technology Plan promotes the integration of technology planning across the colleges by establishing a common framework for college technology planning. The District Technology Implementation Plan established measures and prioritized deployment of technology solutions in consideration of available resources. The Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC) serves as a clearinghouse for all policy issues related to district-wide technology systems.

5. Evaluation of Integrated Planning

Assessment of Strategic Plan Goals

DSP measures are constructed using a uniform methodology and data sources, are derived for each college, and then aggregated for the District as a whole. Through their planning and effectiveness reporting, colleges assess progress, establish targets, and develop action plans to advance both college and District objectives. Colleges’ annual assessments and those of the District as a whole are reported to the Board of Trustees on a regular annual cycle using a standard format, allowing for an apples-to-apples Districtwide discussion. These reports help the Board identify and focus on a limited number of objectives for their annual goal-setting process, which in turn shapes college planning priorities and initiatives. The reporting cycle thereby serves to close the institutional effectiveness loop and promote continuous quality improvement.

Assessment of Integrated Planning Process

The DSP is evaluated at the mid-point of the planning cycle and is revised during the final year of the planning cycle. Mid-cycle evaluation conducted by DPAC, which re-evaluates the district mission, goals, objectives, and metrics for currency and relevance, with a focus on alignment with national and state-wide initiatives, accreditation standards, utility of data.

Since shared governance committees have an oversight role or responsibilities in the planning-resource allocation processes, a complete assessment of integrated planning also utilizes the assessments of governance committees.