

District Accreditation Coordination Workgroup (DACW)

Meeting Notes

January 16, 2009

Attendees: Michael Arnoldus (DAC), Michael Callahan (VC), Jaime Casillas (OC), P. Scott Corbett (OC), Richard Dawe (DAC), Brian Hu (DAC), Carolyn Inouye (OC), David Keebler (VC), Tim McGrath (MC), Lisa Putnam (MC), Peter Sezzi (VC), Tim Stewart (MC), Margaret Tennant (MC)

Handouts: **Agenda**
Meeting notes from 11/21/08 meeting

Meeting notes and agendas will be posted as soon as possible on Luminis, where a group channel has been established for DACW. These documents will also be posted on the "Committees - DACW" web page on the District Home Page.

1. Update: status or progress of each college toward accreditation preparation

- Each campus to present one page outline of plans regarding structure and process

Handouts: **Memos re: campus accreditation process for Moorpark, Oxnard Colleges**

As determined by the Chancellor and Cabinet, the primary emphasis and initial focus for the accreditation process should be on functional mapping, based on past accreditation recommendations. This will serve as a foundation for much of the required preparation at each college and the DAC.

David Keebler provided a verbal update of Ventura College accreditation preparations. Their goal is to get as much pre-work completed as possible before assigning teams to each area. The policies and other resource documents have been placed online, and they will create an indexed repository of all evidence by standard in a common database. They are looking at prior year's reports, accreditation recommendations, etc. Additionally, they have conducted a "gut feeling" audit on how each person perceives the current status of VC's accreditation preparation. An ad hoc group has been formed consisting of management and other key stakeholders.

Richard Dawe stated that he will be interested in the different approaches, and would like to see opportunities to share best practices between campuses, particularly related to how each college includes various stakeholder groups, including students.

Jaime Casillas addressed his memo handout of Oxnard College's accreditation status. As of January '09, they have received a preliminary report regarding all recommendations from previous reviews that they have fully addressed. They have formed an accreditation committee with diverse representation (see memo), and are trying to get students involved in the process as well by reaching out to campus Associated Student Government. Two meetings were held in late fall, launching training subcommittees with lead faculty and managers assigned. A further sub-level committee is formed of campus personnel at large. They are using a division model, and accreditation is a standing discussion item on the Dean's meeting agendas. The challenge for Oxnard College in the past has been institutionalizing the process, which is being addressed early on in the process this year. They are starting to use Luminis and have a group established, and will have training in January for use of the information repository. They are hoping for transparent information on District involvement in the process and are looking forward to the District-wide approach to issues common to each campus.

Brenda Shubert commented that Moorpark College has a standing committee of participatory governance called "EdCap" which operates year round and is involved in the planning process. Tim McGrath and Tim Stewart have co-chaired this committee in recent years and will spearhead the current process.

Tim McGrath reported that since the receipt of their mid-term report, they have followed guidelines including conducting a GAP analysis. They have created 11 subcommittees matched to each standard. Further, they have done research on each standard and provide required reports to EdCap each month. Bullet points have been created for each issue other than District sections. They anticipate that the final draft will be written in fall and completed by spring. They are also having issues with student involvement, but the timing of meetings makes it difficult for student participation, so they may focus on student involvement further into the process when bullet lists are completed. One Moorpark College problem is that the report for accreditation is due every 3 years, and traditionally the yearly rotation of co-chairs required a very fast ramp-up time for new participants. They are now using a rotation that includes

participation on the committee prior to being co-chair, so as to be fully informed prior to taking a chair position and provide overlap in trained personnel. They have instituted a 6-year accreditation calendar which provides cohesion to the process throughout the accreditation cycle. Another issue they are addressing is asking the Academic Senate President to attend each meeting and identify potential problematic issues. A key component is to the accreditation process is the Institutional Researcher.

2. Possible usage of Luminis discussion group channel

A channel has been established on the Luminis portal for a DACW group discussion channel. Richard Dawe would like to encourage team members to use this tool for ongoing dialog, and asked team members for their input on how best to use this tool. One suggestion was to use this as a starting point for people with questions regarding the accreditation process and responsible parties.

Tm McGrath suggested that posting key sections of standards that involve the District would be a good starting point and would encourage the campuses to complete their sections. Examples of how previous recommendations have been addressed by the District would be helpful, as well as identifying campus-specific subjects where District input would be beneficial.

The individual campus reports have a certain amount of commonality, and can be provide on Luminis for reference. Additionally, the individual lists of accreditation issues and recommendations could be posted. Jaime Casillas suggested it would be helpful to post documents with imbedded links that provide access to related historical documents. These suggestions are just a few that will enable the team to use Luminis to integrate the District's role in the accreditation process. Further recommendations for shared documents including posting mid-term reports and responses on Luminis. Conversational threads could also be established for each accreditation standard. It was discussed that reports and discussions might also be placed on the web site, however Carolyn Inouye expressed her concern that it would not be beneficial to have draft documents and inter-committee discussions available to outside parties, as we would not like the public to be able to view our accreditation process and issues. Carolyn's past experience with portals had password protected areas where accreditation team members could review the details of the process, but these materials could not be viewed by the public.

Ramiro Sanchez suggested that standing District Councils could be utilized for leverage to address district-wide recommendations.

Action Item: Dave Fuhrmann will be asked to present to the group on tips for Luminis usage.

3. District-wide functional mapping

**Handout: VCCCD Functional Mapping
Standard Assignments by Campus
Template for Functional Areas and Standard Assignments**

Richard Dawe has looked at other California community college districts to identify key areas for functional mapping. He has drafted a template and begun to identify functional areas and cross mapping to accreditation standards. The team suggested various ways to approach the mapping project and possible categories to be added or deleted. The current request from the Chancellor and the Cabinet is for the DACW to review the template and agree on the listing of functional areas and responsible parties. The final instrument will become a common document of district mapping that campus teams can refer to for contacts and resources for additional information. This process will also serve as a GAP analysis to identify lapses or problem areas, although the team will need to focus on the purpose of functional mapping and stay with broad categories, rather than use the tool to identify gaps for the purpose of accreditation.

Tim McGrath indicated that this type of mapping would be beneficial to Moorpark College's six-year review cycle, however he would not like to see a lot of time put into this document to assure that adequate time is allowed for the actual writing process.

Action Item: Richard Dawe will post samples of other districts' mapping documents to use as starting point for team review. Jaime Casillas will help assist in populating the VCCCD template draft, and then team members will provide input on additions or deletions of functional areas and column headings for mapping and responsibilities.

Suggestions for additions and deletions to the mapping document will be posted on Luminis for group review within 2 weeks.

4. Group process discussion

- Focus group: District-wide recommendations from accreditation reports

Due to time restraints, this item will be tabled to the next meeting.

5. Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 20. Discussion items will include:

- Functional map review
- Agreement on group priorities