
LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
District Accreditation Coordinating Committee Meeting
April 28, 2021
2:00-3:00 p.m.

Present-Jamey Nye, Julie Oliver, Kim Harrell, Monica Pactol, Albert Garcia, Gayle Pitman, Adam Karp, Francis Fletcher, Emily Bond, Dyan Pease, Bernadette Anayah, Bill Simpson, Lindsey Campbell, Patti Leonard, Steven McDowell, Betty Glycer-Culver

Welcome

Approval of agenda with the addition of: Posting/Notification of Visit; Timeline Modifications

Los Rios Strategic Plan Reaffirmation

- It was noted that the process for the strategic plan will be discussed by the Chancellor's Cabinet this semester and will be implemented in the fall within the framework that we have already created. We may begin to look at the strategic plan annually instead of trying to predict for five years with a framework that could be adjusted. Engagement and input from all stakeholders will be obtained. For the ISERs, we will describe that process via an outline generated from Chancellor's Cabinet that will be shared and any updates to our ISERs will be made as we go through the process which will not be completed by the time they are presented to the Board in November. Next Chancellor's Cabinet meeting is scheduled for Sept 27th.

Request for DO evidence

- Request to let district know how the campuses would like information to be available. A central location where the campuses can link directly to it was suggested.

Discussion with ACCJC Vice President

- It was noted that there are concerns from some at the colleges that efforts toward centralization of financial aid and admissions and records should be paused until after we have been re-accredited and gone through the whole process.
- The ACCJC VP noted that they understand that colleges are in a constant state of flux and the whole purpose of the self-evaluation and reflection is to make improvements and make changes when you identify them. She encouraged the district to move forward with whatever has been identified to serve the students better. A district function map should be updated with the areas we've identified where changes are needed. The ISER could contain information about where we are moving and why but not make any firm promises. Any changes that may occur between the time the ISER is submitted and the team chair visits could be reported by the college presidents and the ability to provide an addendum is also an option. It was noted that the ISER is a snapshot in time proving that we meet the accreditation standards. Standard 4.D is related to the chancellor and standard 4.B is related to the college presidents. 4D indicates the chancellor needs to clearly delineate, document, and communicate the work responsibilities and functions of the district and there needs to be understanding of what those are. We don't want to have four different function maps indicating that everybody's doing their own thing and no one knows who supposed to do what

- Question regarding whether or not centralization efforts could jeopardize each colleges accreditation status. As long as the eligibility requirements are met, how a district chooses to meet the needs of the students is their option. Each community college district can be unique in how they deliver the services as long as they are meeting the requirements. Standard 4D7 is about evaluating our roles and how decisions are made to try to make it better.
- Should the centralization topic be raised in standard 2c? It was noted that this standard does mention specific services and we would need to demonstrate that we meet those standards.
- Question was asked regarding if how we are going about the centralization process could be an issue. ACC JC doesn't tell districts how much to centralize or decentralize. Standard 4a concerns following rules and responsibilities within our governance system and that administrators and faculty, through policies and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget. They are not the decision makers but there's a substantive and clearly defined role.
- It was noted the ISER does not need to be a big historical novel about how everything came to be at your college. It's really just "here's evidence that demonstrates we meet the standard." Also including examples of how changes were made and the steps that were taken that follow the stated process would be good
- Formative/summative - The team ISER review dates are set. There will be a district team which is composed from the various college teams and they will come together on February 21 to do a review of the district components and then each successive day will review each college
- The ACCJC VP explained the process including all the pre-visit work the review do before the kickoff at the campus. It was suggested that the campuses be ready for evidence requests approximately two weeks before their visit. It was noted that the college visits will be in person but the district visit may be virtual

Posting/notification of visit

- It was noted that the opportunity for feedback and third-party comment is part of due process and required by federal regulations. So a semester prior, the draft reports should be circulating and a link to a page where third-party input should be put up on the website so it's an opportunity for comment and also notification that a visit will be occurring. Valid third-party concerns are shared with the team chair and the college president and become a supplement to the entire body of evidence.

Timeline updates were presented.

Future Meeting Dates:

4th Wednesdays @ 2:00-3:00 August 26