Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:07 p.m.

Opening Remarks

G. Colombo welcomed the DPC to a new academic year & noted that there is much work to do—particularly related to addressing the planning needs of the district & the recommendations stemming from the spring accreditation site visits. The committee members then introduced themselves.

Approval of Minutes 6-6-09 DPC Meeting

The minutes of the 6-6-09 DPC meetings were reviewed and approved as submitted.

Review of DPC Schedule

The committee reviewed the proposed DPC meeting dates and times for 2009-10. After some discussion, it was agreed to hold to the revised calendar. However, G. Colombo will check on the agenda for the AFT Chairs Workshop on October 23rd, and, if substantive issues will be addressed in the afternoon session of that event, the DPC will consider moving it’s meeting back on that date. Also, it was noted that the meeting on November 6th will begin at 1:30 due to a room conflict. All meetings will be held in the Faculty and Staff Center at LACC.

DPC Goals for 2009-10

Committee members reviewed the proposed DPC goals for the year. It was agreed to pursue the goals as submitted:

1. Guide Response to District Accreditation Recommendations
2. College Planning Handbooks
3. College Governance Handbooks
4. College IE Websites
5. Fall SLO Workshop
6. Summative Assessment of District Strategic Plan
7. Draft Process for DSP Revision

During the ensuing discussion, it was noted that it would require serious work to counteract negative attitudes about accreditation and accreditation-related planning requirements. It was observed that such attitudes surfaced during the Board’s recent review of ELAC’s accreditation Follow-up Report.

Program Review Taskforce Report

R. Tillberg reported that members of the District Research Committee and others had participated in a series of trainings on Visual Composer, a software system that allows for the automated production of
formatted reports. She also noted that a group of RP Taskforce reps had been meeting regularly with District IT staff to begin designing a district-wide RP tool and that these meetings have been going quite well. The group hopes to create a flexible PR system that will allow the colleges to select from among a “library” of different modules so that they can tailor their PR to their own campus needs. Several of the colleges have been actively involved in this effort. The specifications for this system should be completed within the next month or so. Once this is done, District IT will provide an estimate of the resources needed to complete the project. It is estimated that the system will take 6-7 months to develop. The Taskforce hopes that modules can be included that will address Student Learning Outcomes and unit planning as well as comprehensive program review. Ultimately, what is needed is more input from the colleges in terms of their own program review requirements. It was suggested that the system might also incorporate aspects of the College Self Inventory so that reporting of some of these data could be automated. In addition, concerns were raised about the sustainability of such a home-grown system—both in terms of maintenance costs and in terms of documentation. It was noted that this type of system will require updating on at least an annual basis and that this activity may require the formation of a permanent Program Review Steering Committee.

**College Planning/Accreditation Reports to Board of Trustees**

K. Daar offered a very brief report of the Board’s review of ELAC’s one-page accreditation Follow-up Report. The committee then reprised the schedule of college reports to the Board of Trustees Planning and Student Success Committee for 2009-10. D. Kaye will be working with the Seaside colleges over coming months to help them coordinate their accreditation efforts and prepare for their first Board report after the first of the year.

**Process for Responding to District Accreditation Recommendations**

G. Colombo walked the committee through proposed processes for responding to the two substantive district-wide recommendations emerging from the Cityside visits in Spring 2009. Recommendation #1 calls for the District to continue monitoring its progress in complying with its GASB 45 plan. D. Kaye will work with District staff to respond to this recommendation for all nine colleges. Recommendation #2 calls for assessing the accuracy of the delineation of functions offered in the “District/College Functional Map.” This document was created last fall in response to an earlier round of accreditation recommendations. The proposed process for responding to the current recommendation involves a 7-step process of review and revision:

1: Update District Office Service Outcomes (September-October 7, 2009)
2: Update all District-wide Committee Descriptions (September-October 15, 2009)
3: Augment Sections on District-wide Planning and Decision Making (September-October 15)
4: Survey District Office User Groups (October 2009—December 2009)
5: Complete District Office User Satisfaction Surveys (October 2009—December 2009)
6: Fall DAS Summit & AFT Chairs Retreat Surveys (September—October 2009)
7: Final Review of Revised Functional Map (December 2009—January 2010)

It was explained that the first three steps had already been initiated. Once completed, a corrected draft of the District Office Service Outcomes will be shared with key user groups to complete step 4. A draft FM assessment survey was shared with the committee. This will be used to gather information on the perceived accuracy of the overall division of district/college functions as described on pages 3 & 4 of the FM.
Recommendation #3 requires the assessment and improvement of all district-wide governance processes. A 4-step process was presented in response to this recommendation:

1: DAS Leadership Summit Survey on District-wide Governance (September 2009)
2: Survey of Stakeholder Groups (October—November 2009)
3: Governance Committee Self Evaluation (November 2009—January 2010)
4: District Governance Assessment Report (January 2010)

The committee reviewed, discussed and, with some modifications, approved a draft Governance Survey document that will be distributed at the DAS Leadership Summit and at the AFT Department Chairs Workshop. In addition, it was suggested that the DPC take both of these surveys directly to the colleges during meetings with college leadership teams over the next few months. This would also offer the opportunity to discuss how the colleges can assess the effectiveness of their own planning and governance processes—and, perhaps, the opportunity to involve the colleges directly in the assessment of the District Strategic Plan.

**Governance and Planning Handbook Template Drafts**

G. Colombo shared draft Governance and Planning Handbook templates with the DPC. These summarize the contents of 8-10 such best-practice documents gathered from colleges around the state. These templates are not meant as rigid prescriptions of what colleges should include in their own handbooks, but only as rough guides to what such handbooks might include. It is also important to keep in mind that the templates include more committees, plans, and suggested content than would be necessary in any individual college’s handbooks. Colleges may also communicate their “handbooks” in a number of ways; for example, some colleges may display this information on their IE websites—and not have paper handbooks at all. However, it was noted that sometimes website-only approaches can limit access to information since not all faculty and staff may access college IE sites on a regular basis.

**Plan for Summative Assessment of the District Strategic Plan**

This issue was postponed until the next DPC meeting.

**Adjournment**

The committee adjourned at 3:05 p.m. The next DPC meeting will be held on October 23, 2009.