



## District Planning and Accreditation Committee

March 25, 2016 Minutes

District Office, Board Hearing Room

**Present:** Michael Allen (Mission), Mary Jo Apigo (West), Leticia Barajas (Trade-Tech), Oleg Bespalov (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 February 26th meeting were reviewed and approved.

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

The ACCJC site visit summaries were presented and well received by the Board. There were questions from Board members about technology, distance education, and library hours. Ryan reported that issues concerning enrollment management would be transferred to IE&SS from Budget & Finance. He also reviewed District recommendations and corrective actions. Addressing the recommendation on completion of employee evaluations will require reconciling paper and digital processes for recording evaluations. Ryan and the CIOs are working on an early warning process to identify classes for which appropriate TBA documentation is not available. The recommendation on review of Board Rules may be facilitated by adoption of the CCLC model, which allows tracking of updates. The recommendation on business continuity relates to the ability of college's to backup and restore critical college-level databases and services such as email and web.

### **Accreditation Visits:**

The package of materials prepared for the March IE&SS meeting was made available which noted the expected commendations, recommendations, and plans for addressing recommendations for the colleges and the ESC. Although there was no recommendation concerning the District Budget Model, Erika noted that this may have been indirectly made through the recommendation on position control. In response to Angela's question about which District recommendations were most challenging, Ryan stated that Board Rules would take the longest and that position control and business continuity would be potentially the most costly and difficult to coordinate. He also noted that the District recommendations were not necessarily directed to the ESC, but were district-wide. Deborah stated that it was important for the colleges to immediately begin work on addressing their recommendations as, based on recent ACCJC actions, most colleges were only reaffirmed for eighteen months and would have to prepare a written response in a year. In response to Barbara's comment concerning the future of the ACCJC, Erika noted that the process of moving to a different accrediting body was long and very involved.

### **Committee Membership:**

Ryan raised the issue of classified and student representation on shared governance committees in general and for DPAC in particular. This is in response to the expected accreditation recommendation on committee membership, the Board policy requiring student representation in areas that impact students, and the need to include these constituencies in developing the new strategic plan. Currently, there is no classified or student representation on DPAC. Ryan posed the additional issue of whether, in considering the demands of future strategic planning activities and the cyclical nature of accreditation activities, the planning and accreditation functions may be better served by having two committees. The consensus of the committee was to propose two committees, the District Planning Committee and the District Accreditation Committee, with the following representation:

Chair: Representative of the Division of Educational Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Co-Chair: Representative of the District Academic Senate

- Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness
- President's Representative
- CIO Representative
- CSSO Representative
- VP Administrative Services Representative
- 9 Administrative Representatives (selected by college president)
- 12 Academic Senate Representatives (one per college, 3 at large by region selected by DAS)
- 3 Student Representatives (By region selected by SAC)
- 3 Classified Staff Representatives (1 AFT 1521A Staff Guild, 1 selected by non-staff guild, 1 unrepresented)
- 1 AFT 1521 Faculty Guild Representative

35 Total members

#### District Accreditation Committee

Chair: Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness

Co-Chair: Selected from the remaining members

- 9 Accreditation Liaison Officers (1 per college)
- 9 Faculty Accreditation Co-Chairs (1 per college)
- President's Representative
- DAS representative

21 Total members

Ryan will develop a more complete draft recommendation which includes the rationale for separate committees, delineation of charges between committees, for review at the next DPAC and discussion with DAS and other constituencies.

#### **Work Groups for Strategic Plan Evaluation:**

Maury discussed the process of strategic plan evaluation and presented a draft template for reviewing strategic plan objectives and metrics. It was clarified that the template, which presented college-level data and information taken from the college planning and effectiveness reports, was not intended for presentation to the Board. The information supplied, in different formats, already been shared with the Board and public, and the college-provided explanations would help build context in evaluating trends. At Ryan's suggestion, a section requesting additional information or data will be added to the template.

#### **IEPI Update:**

Ryan is attempting to obtain closure on whether IEPI goals will require a presentation to the IE&SS Committee and Board, as was done last year, or can provided as an information item. Ryan or Maury will provide an update as soon as this information is available.

#### **Next Meeting:**

Friday, April 22, 2016, 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Board Hearing Room, ESC