



**District Planning Committee  
September 29, 2017 Minutes  
Educational Service Center, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room**

**Attendance:**

Badalyan, Anna	City	Gaitan, Mercedes	AFT 1521A
Biondi, Jill	Mission	Harkins, Tracy	Mission
Cornner, Ryan	ESC	Kudo, Mily	ESC
Echeverri, Angela	DAS/ESC	Pai, Ed	Harbor
Endrijonas, Erika	President’s Rep	Wardinski, Steve	East
Fowles, Michelle	Valley		

The approval of minutes for the August 15, 2017 meeting were placed on hold, since it appears that the attendance list is incomplete.

**Review Updated LACCD Mission:**

Ryan reviewed the current mission statement by highlighting the changes that were made, based on feedback from the last draft. One suggestion from the group was to change the wording of the last sentence so that it has a parallel structure and includes an oxford comma. Another suggestion was to incorporate the idea of supporting the students who are attending to support their own continuous learning/for personal enrichment. Steve agreed with the sentiment, but suggested that it was important to align with the state’s goals and directives. Ed added that just because these students may not be represented in the Mission Statement, does not mean that they will not be served. Others echoed concerns regarding adding to the Mission Statement a focus that is not aligned with the state. Angela suggested changing the wording slightly on the first sentence, so that it is in an active tense (use “...by providing” instead of “...through the provision of”). Another suggestion was to include the idea of LACDD’s commitment to equity; wording was added in the first sentence (“...by providing **equitable and** supportive learning environments...”) and last sentence (“...to enhance the local economy, **to close persistent equity gaps**, and to prepare future community leaders.”). After revisions, the Mission Statement was approved by the group.

Ryan asked whether a vision statement is needed, and the group debated whether the District needed to include a Vision Statement. There were no strong feelings in regards to whether a Vision Statement should or should not be included, and the group decided to be inclusive. Ryan presented feedback to the group regarding the Vision Statement; he reported that some people reacted negatively to the word “change,” as sometimes change can have negative connotations. There was a suggestion to use the word “improve” instead (in the first sentence). A missing preposition was added in the second sentence (“by”). Last, a suggestion was made to be inclusive of life-long learners in the Vision Statement, since it was not included in the Mission Statement; wording was changed in the last sentence to reflect this sentiment (“...to provide a culture of continuous **learning**...”). After revisions, the Vision Statement was approved by the group.

**Review Timeline for Board Approval of DSP:**

Ryan reported that the aim is to send the DSP to the campuses in late October, so that they have the months of November and December to review the plan.

**Review Draft DSP Measures and District-wide Targets:**

Mily introduced the District Strategic Alignment document, which was compiled by EPIE and vetted through the District Research Committee; she asked that the group review each measure to ensure that it is appropriate and that there is a target/goal set for each measure. Identified measures and targets were taken from current accountability systems including: the current DSP, Student Success Scorecard, State

Chancellor's Office System-wide goals, LACCD Board of Trustees goals, and CTE Launchboard. The following changes and targets were agreed upon by the group:

#### Goal 1

- Objective 1, Measure 1: the wording was changed: Number of courses sections offered through dual enrollment; the target was set to a 25% increase.
- Objective 1, Measure 2: the wording was changed: Number and percentage of students who are dual enrolled; the target was set to a 25% increase or 13,750 students.
- Objective 2, Measure 1: the wording was changed: Number and percentage of new LA College Promise students; the target was set to 6,000 students, based on a 50% increase from the number of 2017 LA College Promise students.
- Objective 2, Measure 2: the wording was changed: Number Percentage of LAUSD schools and school districts served by LA College Promise; the target was set to 90% of all LAUSD schools.
- Objective 3, Measure 1: the wording was changed: Number of noncredit adult education courses sections; the proposed target was too low. The new target was set to an increase of 25% over the section count in 2016, or 753 sections.
- Objective 3, Measure 2: the wording was changed: Number and percentage of students who are enrolled in noncredit adult education courses; the proposed target was too low. The new target was set to an increase of 25% over the number of students in noncredit adult education courses in 2016 (11,556), or 14,445 students.
- Objective 4: New measures were added: (1) Number of first-time students, (2) Number of returning students, (3) Percentage of students whose decision to enroll was impacted by newspaper, radio, or television advertisements, and (4) Percentage of students whose decision to enroll was impacted by social media. Targets for measures 1 and 2 will be determined by using the method of 2 standard deviations, and targets for measures 3 and 4 were determined by consensus.

#### Goal 2

- Objective 1, Measure 1: the target was set to 90% of student services having high satisfaction ratings.
- Objective 1, Measure 2: the target was set to 3.6% of students stating they disagree or strongly disagree with the statement, I feel safe and secure at this college.
- Objective 1, Measures 3 and 4 were removed; aspects of these measures are already captured.
- Objective 2, Measures 1 and 2: the target was set to a 3.5 survey rating.
- Objective 2, Measures 3, 4, 5, and 6 were removed.
- Objective 3, Measure 1: the target was set to 26% of students being enrolled full time.
- Objective 3, Measure 2: the target was set to exceeding the state average.
- Objective 4, Measures 1, 2, 3, and 4 were removed. New measure added: Number of programs with zero completions. The target was set to 0, not including completions for the first four years of a program.
- Objective 5: New measure added, "To what extent do you agree with the statement, this college's Wi-Fi is reliable?" The targets for all measures were set to a 3.5 survey rating.
- Objective 6, Measure 1: the target was set to 74%.
- Objective 6, Measure 2: the wording changes: Percentage of new students completing an English assessment before or in the first term or being placed with a multiple measure. The target was set at 81%.
- Objective 6, Measure 3: the wording changes: Percentage of new students completing a Math assessment before or in the first term or being placed with a multiple measure. The target was set at 78%.
- Objective 6, Measures 4 and 5: targets were set at 95%.
- Objective 7, Measure 1: target was set to 90%.

- Objective 7, Measure 2: target was set to 76%
- Objective 7, Measure 3: target was set to exceed statewide performance.
- Objective 7, Measure 4: the wording changes: Percentage of new, first-time students successfully completing at least one English and math class in their first year. Target was set to 29%.
- Objective 7, Measure 5: target was set to exceed statewide performance.

Another draft of the District Strategic Alignment document will be prepared with the changes proposed by the group and will be available at the next DPC.

**Next Meeting:**

Friday, Oct. 13, 2017, 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room, ESC