

Delineation of Functions Review Committee Meeting

Monday, May 6, 2013

Web Meeting/F2F Meeting

AGENDA

1. Reporting feedback from Reviews
2. Discuss how to Handle Recommended Changes
3. Final Report
4. Future Meetings

Meeting Notes:

1) Feedback from Review:

District - The map has been reviewed by the district office personnel. There are a few questions for clarification purposes only and no recommendations for change.

Cañada – The map has been reviewed by different constituents. Feedback from two constituent groups is as follows:

The Student Services Planning Council (SSPC) commented in general that the District and College's roles have been functioning well. SSPC recommended the following be changed to **SHARED**:

Standard III: Resources

- A. Human Resources
4, 4.a., 4.b. and 4.c. (to shared)
- C. Technology Resources
1.c (to shared)
- D. Financial Resources
2., 2.a., 2.c., 2.d., 2.e., and 2.f. (to shared)

The Academic Senate Review of Delineation of Function Map

III.C.1.c

Should this be SH? “Infrastructure” includes phone systems, email systems, internet service, servers, backup systems, Banner, etc. These are primarily District responsibility. “Equipment” would include all of the above, but could also be small scale items such as computer workstations, etc. In this case the College would be primary. The infrastructure components are such a significant component of this standard that it warrants a SH designation.

III.D.1.c

Should this be SH? It seems to us that “long term...liabilities and future obligations” would include compensation of retirees. These are clearly covered by the District.

III.D.2.a

Should this be SH? Isn't the audit contracted and secured by the District?

III.D.2.c

Should this be SH? The College and District both maintain separate reserves. Financial solvency must be ensured at both levels and contingency plans of each party are different.

III.D.2.d

Should this be SH? Ultimately the District must sign off on all grants and grant reports. The District oversees contracts with dining services. The District, not the College, oversees the Foundation. The College does not have institutional investments that it must oversee; the District does have such investments.

CSM – Review was done among all constituent groups. Faculty and admin had no specific comments. No comments were received from classified and student groups. VP Jennifer Hughes has asked them to take one more look. The map was also reviewed at College Council meeting.

Skyline - All groups reviewed the map. College Council last month approved the document as is. Ray Hernandez pointed out 3 sections missing in I, B in the latest version. One of the sub-standards in III is also incorrectly identified.

The missing sections were in the original document and shall be included in the future:

5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.	P	S
6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.	SH	SH
7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.	P	S

Missing substandards a through h in Standard IIID.

- tentative, it was not in the 2006 edition

Missing Standard IIID Item 4

- tentative, it was not in the 2006 edition

2) Handling Recommended Changes

The attendees reviewed the proposed changes from Cañada by its Student Services Planning Council and requested that a brief rationale be provided by Cañada before sharing the recommended changes with other colleges and the district. (This just in...Cañada responded that it was more a consensus of the group that the college works on all of these areas, not just the district as a primary – i.e. college and district share the functions.

3) Final Report

- Attendees recommended that Jing craft a paragraph on the documentation of the effectiveness of the maps as part of the final report. The effectiveness may include how the map is reviewed, the way changes are handled, and that the map has provided adequate guidance for the roles to be appropriately carried out among the colleges and district.
- Report should also include how the changes are reviewed and approved

Future meeting: try last week in May.

Documents:

[Approved Delineation of Functions Process](#)

[Approved Accreditation Function Map \(Revised 2010\)](#)

[Notes from last Function Review Committee meeting \(Nov 8, 2010\)](#)

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Ray Hernandez, Dean, Science/Math/Technology, Skyline College

Jennifer Hughes, Vice President, Student Services, CSM

Jing Luan, Vice Chancellor, Ed Services & Planning/ALO (*Chair*)

Jan Roecks, Dean, Business, Workforce and Athletics, Cañada College