



## **District Planning and Accreditation Committee**

### **February 26, 2016 Minutes**

### **District Office, Board Hearing Room**

**Present:** Michael Allen (Mission), Mary Jo Apigo (West), Leticia Barajas (Trade-Tech), Oleg Beshpalov (Pierce), Ryan Cornner (ESC), Karen Daar (Valley), Barbara Dunsheath (East), Erika Endrijonas (Valley), Michelle Fowles (Valley), Alfred Gallegos (Southwest), Kenadi Le (Trade-Tech), Ed Pai (Harbor), Maury Pearl (ESC), Margarita Pillado (Pierce), Jim Stanbery (Harbor), Dan Walden (City)

The minutes of the November 20<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed and approved.

#### **IE&SS and Board Update:**

Maury reviewed the recent IE&SS presentations on strategic planning and college planning and effectiveness reporting. Erika requested that the five slide maximum for college effectiveness reporting be maintained and Maury agreed to do this. The effectiveness reports were well received by the IE&SS committee. City, East, and Harbor are scheduled to present their reports on April 27<sup>th</sup>; Mission, Pierce, and Southwest were scheduled to May 25<sup>th</sup> to allow for reporting on the accreditation site visits on March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Maury reviewed the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) year two reporting. Erika noted that the IE&SS Committee was not provided with sufficient context at last year's IEPI presentations. She suggested that EPIE develop an introductory presentation describing the IEPI measures and goals within the broader context of the ACCJC institution set standards and the District Strategic Plan. Ryan and Maury will prepare this for the next IEPI presentation. Maury reviewed the reporting requirements for year two. For the colleges, an additional new metric, focusing on unprepared or basic skills, is required. This metric is to be selected from the following Student Success Scorecard metrics: Completion Rate for Unprepared Students, Remedial Progress Rate for Math, Remedial Progress Rate for English, or Remedial Progress Rate for ESL. In addition, there is an optional college metric, which can be selected by the college. In addition, there are two additional District metrics for compliance with State and Federal audits. EPIE will coordinate with the ESC Office of Budget and Management Analysis to obtain and report this information. An updated template will be provided by EPIE, which will also enter each college's data on the IEPI website and certify the submission. The due date to the state for the IEPI goals is June 15<sup>th</sup>. Ryan is working on different process for Board review this year.

#### **Accreditation Preparation and Check-In:**

Colleges and the ESC reported on activities leading up to the March 7-10 accreditation site visits. The ESC had a three hour workshop at the Westin Hotel attended by 250 employees. Ryan prepared a referral guide which the ESC team can use to reference ESC staff that are contacts for a particular standard. Mission reported having town hall and shared governance committee meetings covering the college's responses to the standards and the QFE. Pierce conducted open forums in December, which are also planned for next week. Student outcomes were also discussed in break-out groups as part of Student Success Days. Valley is conducting mock interviews, a town hall meeting next, and discussion of their report at shared governance committee meetings. Harbor conducted a well-attended town hall meeting and meeting with academic clusters to brief the campus community on the college's report and QFE. They are also preparing an addendum to their report to give to the visiting team. East has conducted college meeting focusing on each standard, is planning an open forum and additional meetings at the Southgate center. They have received biographical information about the visiting team members and are waiting to obtain a list of meetings requested by the team. City has prepared an "accreditation survival guide" and conducted well-attended meetings. They have also prepared an addendum to their report to provide to the visiting team. West has prepared an accreditation booklet, conducted town halls, and discussed the report at town halls and with ASO.

The ACCJC decisions on colleges receiving visits in fall 2015 indicated that most colleges were in substantial compliance with accreditation standards and were required to prepare a Follow-Up Report in 18 months.

**Coordination of District Planning Timeline:**

Ryan introduced the discussion setting an appropriate timeframe for the next District Strategic Plan (DSP). Karen noted that it was important to rethink the timeframe since all colleges were now on the same accreditation cycle. Michael mentioned the importance of conducting annual evaluation as evidence of continuous quality improvement and that the plan timeframe was less critical. Erika mentioned the experience in her previous institution in which goals were set at the district level and followed by the colleges. Dan noted that at his previous institution the president favored a three year timeframe, while the faculty wanted a six year framework with annual updates. Rather than timeframe, Ed found the DSP to be valuable in defining metrics with which college plans could align. Establishing the District plan first and then having colleges align with the plan, regardless of timeframe, appeared to meet the needs of most colleges. Most current college plans are based on a five or six year period.

Ryan noted that the process for developing the next DSP would take approximately 18 months and asked for input regarding key elements of the process. He summarized the discussion into a set of guiding principles.

The DSP would require a robust planning process which would:

- Be internally controlled (no outside consultants).
- Involve high level citizen advisory groups, including representation from local area governments, educational leadership, and workforce investment boards to consider macro level topics.
- Involve DPAC and other internal constituencies to focus on level topics
- Include set questions and topics specifically targeted toward each group
- Colleges can align their strategic and educational plans to the District plan after it is developed

Ryan will begin work on developing a planning activity timeframe for the next DSP using these guidelines.

**Work Groups for Strategic Plan Evaluation:**

Ryan discussed the plan for evaluation of the current DSP, which will involve an evaluation of current measures, measure and a narrative to build content around this information. In this process, he stressed the need to examine alignment of the metrics to plan objectives and the meaningfulness of the data. He proposed establishing work groups for each measure coming from DPAC, DRC, DAS, and the VP Councils. He stressed that in the next DSP all included data elements would be based on questions addressed by the plan.

**Program Review and Planning:**

Oleg raised the question of how colleges were aligning their program review and resource allocation processes. At Pierce unit planning is in January to align with the budget development process and the plan runs from June to June. As a result, the goals that are reviewed were those set 18 months ago; current year goals cannot be reviewed since this would be the middle of the current cycle. He wanted to know how the colleges were experiencing a similar disconnect and how they were dealing with it. Ed stated that Harbor is attempting to move to a “just in time” planning model in which unit planning can occur at any time. This would separate the timelines for planning and budgeting.

**Next Meeting:**

Friday, March 25, 2016, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
Board Hearing Room, ESC