

District Planning Committee

Minutes

April 1, 2009

LACCD Board Room

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:38 p.m.

Opening Remarks

G. Colombo noted that the committee would be devoting most of the day's agenda to a special session with Student Information System project consultants from Moran and Associates. He also introduced Subodh Kumar and Teresa Romney of the CFM Group who joined the DPC with District Info Tech Director Jorge Mata for this meeting.

Approval of Minutes of 3-4-09 DPC Meeting as Submitted

Approval of the minutes of the 3-4-09 DPC was postponed until the next meeting.

Prep for College Self Inventory/District Strategic Plan Revision

G. Colombo handed out a sample of a revision "tool" that is being developed to aid in the review of the College Self Inventory and District Strategic Plan. He promised the committee to deliver this heuristic device to them so that they can use it prior discussing the Self Inventory at the next meeting.

Cityside Accreditation Debriefing

A summary of the Cityside accreditation exit reports was shared with the committee. Overall, the colleges received a large number of very positive commendations—often for extremely important achievements. However, it does appear that both ELAC and LATTC may receive negative reports due to the fact that they had not resolved issues called out in their last self studies. It was observed that the ELAC evaluators came away with the impression that the college had not been deeply engaged in the self study process and that many faculty, staff, and students did not seem aware of the purposes of accreditation. In general, accreditation needs to be a team effort—one that engages a number of well-prepared faculty and administrators on a campus. Colleges also need to be sure that a faculty leaders actively participate and support accreditation self study efforts.

D. Kaye again reviewed recommendations for improving college accreditation and SLO efforts that were drafted by a group of district personnel following the Winter Accreditation Institute. In general, the group agreed that the colleges need to stay on "orange alert" every year—and not take a break from their accreditation preparations. Specific recommendations included the following:

- Someone at each college should be assigned to oversee accreditation efforts throughout the six-year period between site visits. With increased demands from the ACCJC, including more frequent follow-up reports (every six months), additional site visits, the midterm report, and the self study, colleges need someone to be faculty chair for longer than the two years of the self study process.

- This accreditation point person should be given 1.0 release during the two years before the evaluation team visit, .6 the year before a midterm report is due, and .4 reassigned the rest of the time.
- A minimum standard should be set for reassigned time for SLO coordinators. The Commission is expecting that all course level, program level, GE, and college-wide SLOs should be written by now and that they are beginning to be regularly assessed, with assessment data being used to provide a rationale for budgetary decisions. Colleges are expected to be at the proficiency level by 2012. So the role of the SLO coordinators is crucial.
- The district should hold a mini-institute for all colleges once a year, with topics similar to the ones offered at the ASCCC institute.
- The district should hold a “mock visit” to prepare colleges for site visits.
- The six colleges not involved in the self study process should meet once or twice a semester to discuss progress and issues.

It was agreed to return to the topic of how best to prepare the colleges for future rounds of accreditation at the next DPC meeting.

Student Information System Input

Scott Weyandt and Chris Nordly of Moran and Associates were introduced to lead the DPC in the next formal phase of the needs assessment for the student information system replacement project. They explained that during this phase of the process, they will work with constituencies across the district to establish a detailed needs assessment for a new system. Then they will develop a cost/benefit analysis that leads to a recommendation for either purchasing a system from a vendor or for building a new system in house. They also explained that the present session would focus on process analysis and would be a follow-up to the “change readiness” discussion that they had had with the DPC at its last meeting.

During ensuing discussion it was noted that district-wide planning requires input from almost all major sources of data, including SIS, SAP, SAPHR, Protocol, etc. It was also noted that the “Pain Points” related to planning efforts include:

- The need to coordinate divergent data sources
- The problem of data reliability
- The lack of agreed upon data definitions
- The problem of engaging faculty and staff actively in the planning process
- The fact that plans have multiple purposes and multiple audiences that cut across college decision-making processes
- The need to automate planning processes to the extent possible to cope with increasing reporting mandates
- The lack of a high functioning, interactive “portal”
- The need to have a single input for each data element
- The complexity of working across the district due to localized student learning outcomes, etc.

The consultants concluded by promising to send their formal summary of the discussion to the DPC once it is completed.

Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 3:25 p.m. The next meeting will be held on May 6, 2009.

