

Board of Trustees Regular Meeting
Wednesday, 8/19/2015
Van de Kamp Innovation Center
2930 Fletcher Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90065

The main purpose of this meeting was to conduct the Board of Trustees's 2015-2016 Leadership and Planning Retreat. The meeting was called to order at 12 p.m. All of the trustees were present, except for the interim Student Trustee. Shortly after the Flag Salute, the Board recessed to Closed Session in accordance to the Brown Act. After a lengthy recess, Board President Svonkin reconvened the meeting at 1:42 pm.

Svonkin announced that the Board might postpone adoption of the 2015-2016 final budget until after September 2nd to allow more time for review and input by all appropriate committees and constituents. He added that the Board had until September 15th to adopt a final budget. Svonkin encouraged the trustees to make room in their calendars to attend upcoming FLEX Day activities at the nine LACCD campuses. Trustee Moreno inquired about the Board calendar for the upcoming year. Svonkin replied that a survey had been sent to the trustees and they would have to determine what schedule works for this Board, while still allowing them to be accessible and transparent.

Board Leadership and Planning Session for 2015-2016

Dr. Jose Leyba, a consultant who has been assisting the Board with its self-evaluation and the Chancellor's evaluation, facilitated the next part of the meeting. Dr. Leyba mentioned he was interim president at L.A. Mission in 2006 and retired from Arizona's Maricopa Community College District where he served in several administrative positions. Leyba stated that they wanted to focus on student success, identify priorities, and develop systems of metrics to evaluate them. He gave a presentation in which he outlined a data-driven planning model for the Board, which asks the following questions: Where are we? Where have we been? Where do we want to be? How is success measured for improvement?

Leyba then discussed the differences among the three main sources of student data used by community colleges:

- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS): Data used by the federal government, but has the most limited definition of completion;
- National Student Clearinghouse (NSC): Has the best national and state data, but does not report per institution;
- Accountability Reporting for California Community Colleges (ARCC): State reporting data is the one used by state legislators;

Leyba discussed national data on 'Six year outcomes for students who started at a 2-year public institution by enrollment intensity.' The data indicates that full-time students are much more likely to complete their educational programs than part-time students. The presentation was followed by a discussion by the trustees as to why students do not attend college full time and how the District might increase its percentage of full-time students.

Chancellor report on LACCD rates for 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013

Chancellor Rodriguez then distributed, and the group discussed, a report titled "Six-year Outcomes of Students Entering LACCD in Fall Semester" for four consecutive graduation years (2010-11, 2011-12,

2012-13, and 2013-14). He added that data for six-year completion rates for 2014-15 would be available in October. He explained that completion included one or more of the following outcomes: degree, certificate, or transfer. For the 2013-14 graduation year, the overall LACCD completion rate was 32.6%. Student completion data for that year is summarized in the table below:

Table 1: Six-Year Outcomes of Students Entering LACCD in Fall Semester (2013-14 Graduation Year)*

	City	East	Harbor	Mission	Pierce	Southwest	Trade	Valley	West	Total
Cohort Size	1,223	2,342	971	800	2,445	440	711	1,747	512	11,191
Degree Rate	16.0%	19.5%	18.4%	15.1%	17.1%	13.0%	12.1%	15.6%	13.0%	16.6%
Certificate Rate	3.1%	6.1%	0.6%	2.2%	2.2%	0.5%	8.0%	3.8%	1.8%	3.5%
Transfer Rate	16.5%	16.7%	18.3%	18.4%	32.5%	13.4%	9.1%	25.9%	20.5%	21.4%
Completion Rate	29.2%	32.4%	28.3%	26.0%	40.9%	21.6%	25.9%	35.1%	29.7%	32.6%

***Cohort Definition (Same as Student Success Scorecard):** First-time students with a minimum of 6 units earned in the District and who attempted any Math or English in the first three years.

The presentation was followed by an extensive discussion of some of the variables that affect completion rates including student academic preparedness, economic factors, scheduling of courses, career pathways, support services (tutoring, library, and counseling), strategies for awarding certificates, outdated curriculum, institutional inflexibility and the lack of responsiveness to student and industry needs. After the discussion, the Board members were broken up into small groups to conduct an exercise in which they reviewed and discussed meeting norms and District goals in an attempt to come up with major themes. Some of the meeting norms that were discussed included respecting and listening to each other's ideas, focusing the agenda on students and District goals, and making data-driven decisions. Some of the goals discussed included improving student completion rates (certificates, degrees, and transfer), expanding library, tutorial, and counseling services, successful accreditation for all colleges, focusing on student success in, and delivery of, Math and English courses, more professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators, expanding CTE (career technical education) training programs, and pursuing additional funding through grants.

Review Local, State, and National Leadership Participation

Two consultants, Leslie Pollner, from Holland & Knight, and Rick Taylor, from Dakota Communications, made an overview presentation of Higher Education Federal Policy to the Board. They also distributed a fact sheet about the LACCD entitled *The Power of Nine*. They stated that both firms have good connections with the White House and Congress and that their goal was to help the Board identify legislative priorities for 2015-16. They discussed the recent visit by trustees Svonkin, Eng, and Fong to Washington D.C., in which they attended 23 different meetings over a period of several days. Some of the major issues in education and potential priorities that were suggested included: ending sequestration, increasing Pell Grant funding and reinstating year-round Pell Grants, reforming graduation rate metrics, simplifying the Free Application for Federal Student Financial Aid (FAFSA), *America's College Promise Act*, *The Campus Accountability and Safety Act*, a new proposed College Ratings System, proposed teacher regulations, the development of a national student unit record

system, *The Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act*, and the Department of Education’s Gainful Employment Rule.

The discussion then shifted to the need for data at the district and college level that describes what we are doing and the need to build relationships with businesses, other colleges, and elected officials. Trustee Hoffman inquired about the possibility of pursuing legislation that would allow undocumented students to obtain federal financial aid. Pollner replied that it would be challenging in the current political environment. Eng discussed how AB 288 on dual enrollment was stalled in appropriations last year and suggested having lobbyists help with state level priorities. Eng also talked about his interest in identifying more large grants from the Departments of Labor and Education. Moreno suggested working with industry to get their support for grant applications, while Kamlager advocated against applying for any and all grants. There was also a discussion about how colleges couldn’t always pursue certain grants because of the lack of curriculum to support some of these grants. The consultants stated they would prepare a list of available funding so that the colleges could review it and added they could be available to review grant applications before they were submitted.

Pollner stated that congressional representatives would be back home in October, around Columbus Day, and they would like to organize visits to the LACCD campuses so they could showcase programs that are of interest to them. They suggested that every college identify three to five things they do very well so they could highlight these programs during the visits. The consultants concluded by announcing that they would visit the District on a monthly basis and provide the trustees with regular updates.

Board Committee Appointments

After the Board recessed for a second Closed Session, President Svonkin announced the following Board Committee appointments:

Committee	Chair	Members
Budget & Finance	Sydney Kamlager	Mike Eng Ernie Moreno
Facilities Master Planning & Oversight	Ernest H. Moreno	Sydney Kamlager Scott Svonkin
Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success Committee (Including Accreditation)	Mike Fong	Andra Hoffman Nancy Pearlman
Legislative and Public Affairs	Andra Hoffman	Mike Eng Mike Fong
Committee of the Whole on Innovation and Special Interests (COW)	Mike Eng	Mike Fong Andra Hoffman Sydney Kamlager Ernest Moreno Nancy Pearlman Scott Svonkin
Student Affairs		Student Trustee
Board Goals and Evaluation	Proposed	

Report submitted by DAS 1st Vice President Angela Echeverri