

**Ventura County Community College District
District Accreditation Coordination Workgroup
Meeting Notes for February 20, 2009
Location: District Administrative Center, Multipurpose Room
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.**

Attendees: Michael Arnoldus (DAC), Michael Callahan (VC), Jaime Casillas (OC), P. Scott Corbett (OC), Richard Dawe (DAC), David Keebler (VC), Tim McGrath (MC), Peter Sezzi (VC), Tim Stewart (MC), Margaret Tennant (MC), Brenda Shubert (MC)

Absent: Brian Hu (DAC), Carolyn Inouye (OC), Lisa Putnam (MC), Ramiro Sanchez (VC)

Handouts: **Agenda**
Meeting notes from 1/16/09 meeting
Samples of functional mapping documents from other institutions

1. Luminis functionality demonstration.

Guests: Dave Fuhrmann, Mike Rose.

Dave Fuhrmann and Mike Rose visited to provide a demonstration of the utility of the Luminis portal. It is hoped that the usage of the Luminis portal will provide tools for increased team communication. Mike Rose provided an overview of Group Studio, a collaboration tool, and demonstrated that the DACW group is already set up in Luminis.

Group actions (announcements) may be visible through Personal Alerts as well as the through the group studio activity channel. It is a simple process to add groups to individuals' group channels. The Group Leader will delegate permissions for members, who will probably utilize the Files and Message Board sections most frequently. To facilitate group usage, all members will be designated as "leader" so as to be able to post files, send e-mails and announcements to the group. Any member can post a file, but it does not become visible to the group until the Group Leader has reviewed and approved the posting. The e-mail option sends messages through Outlook, and the "Help" link provides basic help on subjects provided with the program.

Richard Dawe indicated that it may be slightly challenging at first to determine the topics and levels of conversational threads, and how best to navigate through the process. The thread hierarchy can be followed and modified with usage. Any member can start a topic, but members will need to access specific topics to follow threads (no messages or alerts for conversational threads are sent, as in announcements). An indicator will appear on the Group activity channel when new topics/threads are posted.

Some team members from Moorpark College are starting to use Sharepoint (MCShare), which is now available at Moorpark College as a collaboration tool; further developments with the Oxnard and Ventura College campuses and DAC will follow within the next few weeks. Team members using this function will be able to add MCShare with a quick link. Further detail will be provided on this capability.

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

Ventura College. Dave Keebler stated that the rigor of self analysis is to act as a change mechanism for areas that may be found to be out of compliance. At his campus, they are doing an initial compliance audit based on intuition, then they determine if there is evidence to support the issue. If problem areas are identified, they will create an action plan for correction. He will provide samples of templates and tools used as a basis for the factual portion of the self study for other groups to follow, and will post on Luminis for group access.

Oxnard College. Jaime Casillas reported that the Oxnard College lead team met and performed a training session on the launch process. The Oxnard team also provided a training guide based on the WASC materials (synopsis). The response was enthusiastic, positive comments were received, and members voiced appreciation for a process that will not leave gaps, particularly in resource allocation. Jaime hopes to keep the group together as a team, as well as creating sub-committees to cover various segments.

Moorpark College. Tim McGrath announced that Moorpark College team members have incorporated MShare into their process, and are using it for sharing agendas, minutes, and documents. They have divided the accreditation team into three areas: EdCap, FiscalCap, and TechCap. The EdCap team has done evidence gathering and are now writing bullet points for their self study, which should be done in April. They are looking for an *outside* writer and hope to have the writing completed by the end of summer. When current activities are completed in the spring, it will be the first full cycle of the planning process. The Moorpark College team will also be looking at curriculum to assure it is revised and up-to-date for the site visit. Tim stated that he would be willing to share documents with other DACW members, and can provide templates that seem to be working well for their team.

Brenda Shubert stated that core competencies and program purposes have been the focus of their review this fall, as they want to incorporate updates into course catalogs in the next printing. They will be providing documents electronically to the reviewers, which will indicate that the documents are actually being used, rather than documents that have been created for the accreditation visit only. They are also trying to ensure that all shared documents are the most current versions.

Scott Corbett suggested adding references to the related Standards in the footer of all documents, whenever applicable. This tool could also be used to address the integrated planning feature.

3. Present additional models for consideration.

Some examples have been provided today from other institutions, including the Kern County Community College District sample of their mapping document. A suggestion was made at an earlier meeting to cluster functions, which is shown in the Kern County Community College District sample; it would be good to see links to related Standards in this area also.

Margaret Tennant would like a summary at the end of the document, as provided in the Kern CCCD sample. The service provider information is also helpful, but team members will again

need to determine the level of detail to include in the document. Scott Corbett suggested creating appendices to provide additional detail of functional responsibilities, rather than try to capture that level of detail in the template.

Tim Stewart stated that the mapping function meets the needs of identifying the District's versus campus areas of responsibility. The San Diego CCCD sample may be too detailed for our current needs, but may be revisited at a later date.

Jaime Casillas suggested identifying two people from each campus to draft a template of the mapping document, based on the Kern County Community College District sample. This proposed document will answer the accreditation requirement and provide a standardized approach for each campus. Brenda Shubert is not comfortable that the document is a "mapping and decision-making" document, and believes it is more of a functional map but that it does not assist with decision making.

Peter Sezzi especially likes the italicized notes in the Kern sample which indicated centralized versus decentralized responsibility for specific functions. Dave Keebler suggested the team use "distributed" as a third term to indicate that a central process has been developed, then distributed to the campuses for implementation.

Consensus: The team will use the Kern CCCD model as a basis, but it will be organized more to reflect VCCCD specifics. Richard Dawe will create a draft of the introduction and shell of the template, will post on the Luminis DACW workgroup tab, and will provide a sample to the Chancellor's Cabinet.

4. Discuss and agree to a district functions list.

The team will review the breakdown of functions on the Kern CCCD model to customize the categories for VCCCD, but will also need to determine the priorities for campus needs. WASC is going to be looking at the District core functions through the same lens as campuses.

Tim Stewart stated that the team will need a clear identification of District decision-making parties for reference or questions. He would also like to see documentation of other committees, their roles in accreditation, and contacts for additional information and decisions.

Scott Corbett pointed out that portions of the report must be written by District personnel. DACW will receive portions of documents from the District, but he is not sure whether these sections will be modified to match the style of other sections, or if they must be used wholesale as received. Jaime Casillas stated that some District managers want to see a cohesive approach for three campuses, to eliminate the duplication of efforts for each.

Richard Dawe stated that identifying critical and common aspects of the report will help to ease this process, and will determine what sections need District participation, how to identify responsible parties, and provide clear communication to the committees.

David Keebler reported that in the past, his approach was to do a compliance audit, responding to the standards in a non-narrative manner. This approach separates the process from the self-study narrative. Compliance is so important that it needs to be completed first, then inserted into individual self study documents. Adding notations to the corresponding Standards will assist in identifying the responsible parties, both in the District and at the campuses.

5. Group process and future priorities discussion

Other ideas and discussion points.

Tim Stewart suggested creating a six-year cycle to assure that the process goes on building towards the next cycle of accreditation. It would be helpful to implement timelines, responsibilities, mid-year reports, etc. to institutionalize the process. Part of the process is to identify the next group members and provide training to them as the process develops.

David Keebler provided a handout which is a sample of an Access database that provides a numbering process by standard to indicate compliance level, then indicates measures of improvement. This process is sustainable, and provides for updates as needed.

Wrap-up.

Richard Dawe thanked the group for participating, will provide a recap of the progress that has been made to the Cabinet on Monday, and will provide meeting notes as soon as possible. For future meetings, he will request more group input for suggesting agenda items. The team should feel encouraged about the progress being made in the mapping process.

Next meeting.

The next scheduled meeting is March 20, which is also the date for further District Management training. The location of the DACW meeting may be adjusted to coordinate with the management training.