

CONSENT AGENDA NO.

Approval of Minutes of the April 3, 2012 Work Session

It is recommended that the Board approve the minutes of the April 3, 2012 Board of Trustees Work Session.

Board Members and Officers Present:

Mr. Jerry Prater (chair)

Charletta Rogers Compton

Mr. Bob Ferguson

Ms. Diana Flores

Mr. Wesley Jameson

Dr. Wright Lassiter (board secretary and chancellor)

Mr. Bill Metzger (arriving at 3:52 p.m.)

Mr. JL Sonny Williams

Absent: None

Chairman Prater convened the meeting at 1:42 p.m.

**CERTIFICATION OF NOTICE POSTED
FOR THE APRIL 3, 2012
WORK SESSION OF THE
DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
AND RICHLAND COLLEGIATE HIGH SCHOOL
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

I, Wright L. Lassiter, Jr., Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Dallas County Community College District, do certify that a copy of this notice was posted on the 30th day of March 2012, in a place convenient to the public in the District Office Administration Building, and a copy of this notice was provided on the 30th day of March 2012, to John F. Warren, County Clerk of Dallas County, Texas, and the notice was posted on the bulletin board at the George Allen Sr. Courts Building, all as required by the Texas Government Code, §551.054.



Wright L. Lassiter, Jr., Secretary

Certification of Notice Posted for the Meeting

Dr. Lassiter certified the notice had been posted as required.

Continuation of March 6, 2012 Interim Update to Multi-Year Financial Outlook & Plan, FY 2012-2014 starting with Tuition Discussion: Dual Credit

Executive Vice Chancellor Ed DesPlas briefly recounted the March presentation discussion, and updated previous discussion of the CPI-U, as measured from February to February. Details related to the current tuition for dual credit were summarized with a model for reduction of the tuition waiver proposed. The Board engaged in dialogue regarding income generation and the potential impact to students and enrollment. Trustee Compton requested that the previous report on dual credit be resent to all members of the Board to help inform future discussions.

The Board returned to a discussion of compensation and facility needs, including a discussion of salary compression and schedule/job reviews designed to maintain marketability. Trustee Williams requested a recap of prior salary increases as compared to the CPI-U benchmark. Regarding facilities cost estimate of \$86 million, it was confirmed that this amount does not include ADA (estimated \$12 million cost) or telephone closet/infrastructure (another estimated \$12 million cost). Trustee Flores requested a multi-variable model including tax rates and other sources of income that would allow the Board to make decisions on funding identified needs. Chair Prater requested that the model include possible combinations from income sources that would support “forward thinking” decision-making. Trustee Flores also requested a recap of individual impacts for proposed tax rates (i.e. average increase cost for homeowners).

The work session was temporarily stopped at 3 p.m. to allow the posted Audit Committee meeting to occur on time. The work session was reconvened at 3:50 p.m. and Trustee Metzger arrived at 3:52 p.m.

Update on Financial Aid Services

Provost Sharon Blackman introduced the new Executive Director of Financial Aid, Cynthia Butler, who provided the Board with a handout addressing historical data about financial aid, award processing for 2011 through 2013, and work with Global Financial Aid Services. The early preparation for 2012 fall awards was acknowledged by the Board. Trustee Ferguson requested clarification on the percentage of DCCCD students receiving aid vs. the number of financial aid applications processed. A report on “pending” students was requested, identifying whether the requested award was for fall 2011 or spring 2012.

Continuation of planning discussion from March 6, 2012 Special Board Meeting

Dr. Lassiter introduced the discussion saying that the continuing refinement of the District's planning process would be responsive to calls for increased accountability and student success, including more descriptive measurement and planned updates. He advised the Board that the action item to adopt a revised plan had been pulled from the afternoon agenda, in order to give the staff time to answer questions from Trustee Flores received on April 2 (with her request that her questions become a part of the written record), as well as engage an outside consultant to advise the Board if requested. To give the Board the college perspective on use of the proposed plan, President Jean Conway provided a recap of DCCCD history in planning; Interim-President Kay Eggleston provided reflection on the use of strategic planning, providing focus and alignment for a "vital few" to support higher performance outcomes; and President Thom Chesney described a college discussion regarding the drafted plan and how it relates to on-going college planning discussions. Trustee Flores 1) requested that the Presidents provide copies of their presentation notes to the Board, 2) noted the need for a vision statement, and 3) requested that the Board be kept informed of continuing work in this effort.

Questions from Trustee Flores were as follows:

- I. "The Process and Accountability Issues – In Priorities 1 and 3, it is difficult to determine the process to be used and/or implemented that shows the District to be accountable through processes that are data driven, timely and accurate in order to support the completion and documentation that we have to meet as a District and that we, as Board members, can explain and/or defend if we are asked questions.

Questions

1. In this new Strategic Plan how are we going to assess accountability for each college and the district to confirm that we are meeting our Priorities/Goals/Measures?
2. More specifically, the measures that are included in the draft document do not appear to define benchmarks, reporting detail, etc. To that point, if we do not have that kind of implementation information then how do we know we will meet the Goals and Strategic objectives?
3. In order to meet Board Priorities 1 and 3, which seem to be focused in supporting our business and industry partners as well as the communities that we serve, it is not clear that we are doing or have done to date an external environmental scan that details the needs and demands of the local, regional and statewide workforce and economy? Have we done these scans? If so when? If so, when are they going to be shared with the Board so we can be informed of the outcomes of these scans and how they inform the planning process for the individual colleges and the District?

4. Without knowing what our businesses and industries need as well as what occupations are growing/expanding/declining and/or becoming new areas of creating new jobs in the workplace, how do our colleges and the District know where to focus efforts to support student success and meet workforce and economic needs?
5. Another related question is if we are going to meet Board Priorities 1 and 3, how do we know what we have and have done/are doing internally in our current Career and Technical programs and if our programs are in line with what is needed to meet current and near future workforce needs and demands in the public and/or private sector? Do we know that we have the right programs? That they are big enough? That they are up-to-date with skill development, etc.? If we have done an external scan does that connect to any internal scan that we have done of our career technical programs? Have we done internal scans? If so, when? If so, when are they going to be shared with the Board?
6. My point with these five questions is very simple. If we are going to move in the direction of this proposed Planning Model/Strategic Plan then how do we defend that we did what we said we were going to do/accomplish? As a board member, how do I defend to constituents/taxpayers/students that we did what we all approved?

Scan Definitions

Below is my understanding of external and internal environmental scans.

External environmental scan. This scan includes a compilation of the most recent census and Labor Market data on business, industry, and demographic trends within the district's service areas. In addition, interviews of key stakeholders from community, public, and business areas of the district are an important component of this scan.

Internal environmental scan. This scan focuses on all programs and services and in particular Career and Technical Education and economic development programs of the district. Economic development and contract education programs will need to be examined at each college within the context of the special regional initiatives maintained by the college. In formative terms, input from lead college and district staff collected during the internal scan (interviews) should be incorporated into the research design of the external data scan.

Are these correct definitions as applied by DCCCD? If so, my question again is, when and how often are external and internal scans conducted, by whom, with what process, and how are the results used to inform the planning process for the individual colleges and the District as a whole.

II. Diversity – Listed below are some questions that I have related to how are we going to define what the college and district will do to understand and address the needs of our changing communities.

Questions

1. Overall, it is not clear how we are defining the students that we serve in each one of the measures that are listed. Is there something missing that will define that detail?
2. When it comes to employees, how will we document the demographics of who we recruit, hire, and retain? There is no mention of that in any of the measures. All we detail is numbers. As a board member I must respond to constituents when asked about who works at our district and how we hire and retain our employees. This is particularly important when I receive these questions from people who show me their resumes and feel they are fully qualified, yet most do not even receive an interview. In one particular instance that I am aware of and noted in last month's statement for the record (March 2012), the Presidential search committee asked for permission and the Chancellor granted permission to disregard HR policies that 3-5 finalists be sent to him. He granted them permission to send only two. The third candidate happened to be Hispanic. The first two happened to be an Anglo male and an Anglo female. If this is what the Chancellor is doing, what are the colleges doing? And how is that fulfilling Board policy on diversity?

III. Implementation Plan

Questions

1. Once the Board has adopted its Strategic Plan, how will we, the Board, know the process used to implement the priorities/goals/objectives in our Strategic plan at each college and District overall? How can we be assured that there will be no deviation or disregard of the priorities/goals/objectives?
2. Is there an Implementation Plan that will be developed in conjunction with the Strategic Plan? If so, I ask that it be shared with Board members.
3. Will the Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan for each college and District be available on the respective websites?"

Adjournment

Chairman Prater adjourned the work session at 4.50 p.m.

Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Approved:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Wright L. Lassiter, Jr.", is written over a blue horizontal line.

Wright L. Lassiter, Jr., Secretary