

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting

December 7, 2007 (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)

Ethan Way Center 205

NOTES

1 9:15 AM Call to Order & Introductions

Present: Cathy Chenu-Campbell, Anne Licciardi, Nell Moffet (SCC); Gordon Lam (FLC); Kathy McLain (CRC); Kathie Read (ARC); Kelly Irwin (Classified Senate); Betty Glycer-Culver (Institutional Research); and Co-Chairs Bill Karns (Chancellor's Office) and Jane de Leon (District Academic Senate).

Excused: Anthony Barcellos, Norv Wellsfry

2 Approval of the Agenda: approved by consensus

3 Approval of the Notes for November 2, 2007: approved by consensus, with the revision on page 2 on the date that FLC will complete its first draft of the self study from "end of spring 2007" to "end of spring 2008."

4 Discussion

a) Update on the request to the managers for drafts of the descriptions, analysis/self-evaluation, and planning agenda

Bill distributed copies of "District Office Support Service Accreditation: Description/Analysis/Planning Agenda Responsibility Grid." This first draft is formatted as a matrix that summarizes the accreditation standards and aspects of the standards (columns 1 & 2) and suggests the District office and District managers responsible for writing the description, analysis, and planning agenda for District-level functions addressed by the standards (columns 3 & 4). Bill requested that members of this Accreditation Coordination Committee: 1) share this draft with their college accreditation teams and 2) request revisions or additions to the third & fourth columns. The aims in requesting this feedback: to ensure the accuracy of the information and to ensure that the interests and needs of the college teams are met.

One addition made to the first page of the matrix the discussion: Add Betty's name to 2.B.3.e

Nell expressed appreciation for Bill's preparation of this document and for its usefulness in the active involvement of the District office in preparing this important

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 7 December 2007 (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)

D R A F T for Review by the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee

information. She suggested this sequence for preparing the information: work from the data and evidence.

Kathy McLane suggested that the evidence compiled from previous studies might be cross referenced to the new standards and to Los Rios language. The accreditation coordination committee accepted her gracious offer to share her work already completed on this cross referencing.

Time frames agreed upon for the dialogue between the college teams and the District office:

<i>Action</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
◆ Additions or revisions to the matrix, columns 3 & 4 from the college accreditation teams	Before leaving for the winter break
◆ Description, analysis, and planning agenda from the district managers responsible for addressing the standard	March 2008

Concerning Standard 2C.1.d: Bill asked if the reference to “Institution” is to colleges; responses included the following:

- ◆ Cathy responded that staff at colleges are well-aware of IT’s role in maintaining security for LOIS and further suggested that the college descriptions would likely show uniformity.
- ◆ Kathy McLain suggested the possibility that shared governance groups are a focus; members of the committee agreed that groups should be listed within this document, and Betty Glycer-Culver suggested that the work flow should go from the person named, with additional names and groups included as the college teams identify the necessary data.

Requests from the committee, with suggested disposition

<i>Request</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
◆ Posting of program review data either on the District’s Accreditation Web page or linked through to the appropriate Website	Bill will work with District staff to accomplish
◆ Copy of the final report on the District Academic Senate’s 2006-2007 review of the District’s shared governance groups	Jane will forward a copy when she sends the draft minutes for this meeting
◆ Posting of the Board’s meeting dates and agenda.	Bill will follow-up

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 7 December 2007 (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)

D R A F T for Review by the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee

- b) **Update on mapping** Bill distributed copies of “Draft 0” and will forward the electronic copy of “draft 0” for use by the colleges. He suggested using this document for collecting data.

Points covered in response to “Draft 0”:

- ◆ Top page, including Note: Concerning what “institution” means, Nell emphasized the distinction between the District Office’s mission and the Los Rios mission. Jane suggested that we should create two different terms when we are talking about “institution” as college versus “institution” as the college and District combined. Cathy added that the term “shared responsibility” can mean one of two things: literal sharing of responsibility *or* parallel responsibility, to which Nell suggested a third option, i.e., District-wide consensus. For three of the concepts, Betty suggested using the terms “District office (DO)”; “District wide (DW)”; and “Shared (SH-DO). Still to be created: the term and acronym for the option describing parallel responsibility.
 - ◆ Bill reminded the group: the two purpose of mapping are to compel dialogue between the colleges and the District office and to remind the colleges of the interrelationship with the District office for these responsibilities. Effective mapping can point to content that can be included in the assessment and planning agenda. Required for effective mapping: a simple structure
 - ◆ Members of the committee agreed to continue refining the text of the rubric.
 - ◆ Kathy asked, “What is, ‘district’ to the ACCJC?” Bill will ask the Commission. Anne Licciardi suggested that the college teams be included in the conversation. The members of the committee agreed to include discussions aimed at constructing a better rubric and will report to the whole committee at a future meeting.
- c) **Scheduling the standards chairs’ discussion with the District reps:** March for the document District services’ descriptions, analyses, and agenda, and directly after March for the meeting times
- d) **Setting up the District’s accreditation Website:** Bill will inquire of Susie Williams
- e) **Coordination & storage of information (10:00 am)**

Question: are the accreditation Web site and storage of information different?

These perspectives on coordination & information storage were shared:

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 7 December 2007 (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)

D R A F T for Review by the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee

ARC	In process: setting up a Web site with categories that will include District and ARC Research, access to committee meetings, accreditation documents from ACCJC. <i>Sharepoint</i> was discussed is not being used
FLC	Web site is on the <i>FLC Insider</i> and is set up by the accreditation standards; a physical repository is also being set up.
SCC	Experimenting with setting up a list of links to resources electronically set up; only current paper documents will be recreated as PDF files
DO	Documents will be cross-linked to colleges; research process and results will be posted to the Institutional Research Web site.
CRC	Will report at the next meeting

Discussion topic suggested by Anne for including on the next agenda: What is public, and what is not?

Report from Mick Holsclaw:

- 1 The two most recent Microsoft Office 2003 & 2007 will work for access ing documents
- 2 Licensing issues will arise if we give outside people access
- 3 *Sharepoint* does bring desirable features, e.g., a Web link to file share. When asked if *Sharepoint* is worthwhile, Mick answered that *Sharepoint* is becoming increasingly important for supporting collaboration. He acknowledged that it is challenging to pair up something new in technology with something as time-driven as the accreditation process
- 4 IT is moving toward assembling materials the team will see
- 5 *Onbase* software has replaced *Keyfile*, and offers these features: capability for pulling text out of an image and indexing, additional search functions, providing Web access for stored documents. Document conversion to *Onbase* is currently occurring, with District-wide completion expected in 60 days.

The question was raised: how can a useful tool be added without the consequence of a too-large learning curve? Cathy cautioned that after looking at *Onbase*, SCC determined that accreditation is not the test project appropriate for placing people on that learning curve because too much difficulty would ensue.

Mick referred to the possibility of using *Onbase* document flow for, perhaps, curriculum support.

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 7 December 2007 (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)

D R A F T for Review by the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee

f) **Lessons learned, to date, at the colleges:** it was agreed that the previous agenda items covered this topic

5 Announcements

a) **Accreditation Institute sponsored by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges: 25 - 27 January 2008; registration is due 14 December**

b) **Meetings in spring 2007:**

- **1 February**
- ~~1 March~~ **7 March [per correction made on 1 February 08]**
- **4 April**
- **2 May**

6 Adjournment occurred near the 11:00 AM deadline.