EXPANDED CHANCELLOR'S CABINET MEETING
Minutes
August 13, 2021
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Zoom Link: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/92058842531

Cabinet Attendees
Jannett Jackson, David Johnson, Nathaniel Jones, Rudy Besikof, Angelica Garcia, Adil Ahmed, Siri Brown, Atheria Smith, Ronald McKinley, Antoine Mehouelley, Mark Johnson, Royl Roberts, Sasha Amiri

Guests: Dr. Janet Fulks, College ALOs (Tina Vasconcellos, Rebecca Opsata, Denise Richardson, Kuni Hay), College VPs (Derek Pinto, Rebecca Opsata/ALO, Garth Kwiecien, Lilia Chavez, Denise Richardson/ALO, Stacey Shears, ~~Sean Brooks~~, Kuni Hay/ALO, Diana Bajrami, Tina Vasconcellos/ALO), Marla Williams-Powell, Joseph Bielanski, Francisco Herrera, Eva Jennings)

Note Taker
Maisha Jameson, Executive Assistant – Chancellor's Office

→ **Purpose - Review status on Requirements:**
- Requirement 6 report and evidence posted in Teams
- Completing ACCJC Requirement 8 on Board Policy with recommendations from BP/AP Taskforce
- Review Requirement 10 on Functional Maps as well as create a plan

→ **Outcomes - The intended outcomes of this meeting are:**
1. Review/Adopt recommendations on Requirement 8 adopting a) analysis of BOT BP/AP status, b) Policy and Procedure Tracking Matrix, c) Updated AP 2410, d) plan to close loop on Requirement 8
2. Review Functional Plan Updates – analysis issues, format ACCJC, ALO/VPs input
3. Use meeting time to add documentation and improve current Functional Maps
4. Create a plan and calendar for Functional map completion and assign responsible parties

I. **Chancellor's Report – Chancellor**

II. **Introductions & Notes**
   a. This is a safe space for confidential discussions.
   b. Reminder that finished and draft documents are in Teams folders
      i. Accreditation-Follow Up report- Requirements- Draft Reports/ Evidence

      ii. Teams Accreditation folder

         1. Went over what to find, where.

         2. All colleges to ensure their respective docs are uploaded.

         3. There will be overlap with documentation that responds to multiple recommendations (include in all appropriate folders).

      iii. Dr. Fulks to consolidate all separate recommendation responses into one document to make-up the Report and Mark Johnson and team will format and brand the reports for each of the colleges.

      iv. May need an editor to look at grammar, links, flow of doc.. ACTION - Dr. Garcia to reach out to Zahra about providing this service.

      v. Need to allow time to offer every opportunity for review of the document by the District community. Changes will be considered on a case-by-case basis as the work continues.

      vi. Evidence to be submitted on FlashDrive and links should be to evidence on FlashDrive. Laney's ISER links will be the model for all Follow-up Reports. ACTION – To follow-up with Rupinder on what she did.

      vii.

   c. Additions to agenda or comments
   d. Update on discussion with ACCJC - Siri and Janet (report format and timeline)

      i. Discussed Teach Out Plan and the new requirement (responses to questions).

         1. To include schools that are on probation, but make note of that.

         2. Tina Vasconcellos provided template for all colleges to use.

         3. Shared what details to include vs. what not needed.

      ii. Functional Map

         1. Shared details of how this should be formatted.

         2. To be developed thoughtfully and be vetted through shared governance in the fall.

      iii. To note in the reports that the report will include plans for moving forward on some recommendations given the busy time of the summer (during COVID and return to campus) that the report was being developed.

III.   **Issues**

a. Discussed Teach Out Plan and the new requirement (responses to questions).
    i. To include schools that are on probation but make note of that.
    ii. Tina Vasconcellos provided a template for all colleges to use.
    iii. Shared what details to include vs. what not needed.
b. Requirement 6 is complete and posted
c. Requirement 8 – worked on by Janet and JB, reviewed by BP/AP Taskforce
    i. Summary – Many BP/AP have not been reviewed over 7 years, many are directly relevant to ACCJC requirements (see Appendix 2 below)
        1. Compared all BP/APs to CCLC's requirements. Some outdated. Some missing all together. The Chancellor has went through and prioritized approach to updating all BPs/APs. Ex. To address those that are required and missing first.
        2. Taskforce working to create a schedule for the updates that spans over seven years (7-yr cycle).
        3. About 50 BPs/APs have already recently been reviewed by legal experts.
        4. To add a note that the BP/AP has been reviewed even if no changes were made.
        5. Shared existing process and proposed new process. Flowchart added to the Teams folder. (Note: Read flowchart from the bottom-up.)
            a. ACTION – Need to confirm what the shared governance review process will be (ex. Cabinet --> PGC--> Chancellor/Board)
                i. Discussion ensued about the current practice of the PFT reviewing new policy before it goes to Cabinet and whether to continue this practice. The suggestion is to move forward without "special interest" involved in this process, and to create policy based on a process that benefits the students (first) and entire organization. It was noted that this is not a normal process across other districts.
                ii.
            b. X
        6. X
    ii. AP 2410 references a matrix which was not found, one was constructed
        1. Shared draft of the matrix which was organized by priority. Review by chapter and by dates included. The matrix shows which BPs/APs that need to be prioritized and for what reason.
    iii. BP/AP2410 need reviewed & updated, if necessary, AP 2410 was not accurate; New AP suggested – all docs posted

1. Shared draft of this AP 2410 on Submission of new BPs/APs and Review of Existing BPS/APs. Provided and discussed feedback. Feedback incorporated into the draft AP.
2. ACTION – Add standing agenda item to the PGC meetings for the Chancellor's Report-back on any action taken.
3. Discussion ensued on how to close the loop on the Chancellor's decision on the recommendations that are presented. And how these decisions are published, disseminated and communicated.
4. ACTION – All to go into the draft AP 2410 document to provide any language or comments for requested areas. Dr. Fulks to add comments on the document where feedback and language is needed.
5. Have met the standard for establishing a process, yet have not yet met the recommendation for implementation of the process.
6. To add this to the Board agenda for the first meeting in September.

iv.

IV. **Requirement 10 – Organizational Charts -> Functional Charts -> Vetting -> Following - ACTION - TO ADD TO THE AGENDA ON MONDAY**

a. See background information below Appendix 1

b. One functional map was old standards
   i. Doesn't make sense to organize by standard. Instead organize by major areas that overlap at District and colleges.
c. Check organizational charts for district and colleges
d. Are the standards the correct way to delineate or should it be by functions and organizational responsibility? ASCCC suggested a different approach – 1map at district website with more specific mapping
e. ACTION – All to go in and fill in what gets done with flow and process.
f. Working to get a draft for now.
g. VC Brown added the spreadsheet doc into the Teams folder (Accreditation folder – Req. 10 working docs)

V. **Plan to move forward**

a. Update COA with correct model for college

b. West Hills Model (in Folder) align with college and district maps, use excel sheet – general delineation to identify potential areas
c. Create a taskforce of ALOs to take maps to final draft and then through shared governance by December??

VI. **Re-check for Drafts and Completion**

a. Tentative Final Draft to be completed on August 30th to go to the colleges for vetting. All docs need to be finalized and sent to Mark by Sept. 15 for formatting.

     b. Dr. Fulks working with ALOs/VPs to ensure that everyone is on the same page.

     c. ALOs to provide something in writing related to: SEM Work, SCFF and Student Services Matrix.

VII. **Follow-up on HERF 2 & 3 Spending** *(if time allows)* - **ACTION - TO ADD TO THE AGENDA ON MONDAY**

VIII. **Management Training Retreat on October 22**

IX. **Agenda Items for Next Expanded Chancellor's Cabinet Meeting – All**

     a. Requirement 10 – Organizational Charts -> Functional Charts -> Vetting -> Following

     b. Follow-up on HERF 2 & 3 Spending

Appendices

Appendix 1 Background information:

     a. District Recommendation 10: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the District <mark>clearly delineate, document and communicate</mark> the operational <u>responsibilities and functions of the District</u> from those of the Colleges and consistently adhere to this delineation in practice. (IV.D.2).

     b. ACCJC Standard *IV.D.2. The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.*

     c. Notes from Peer report:

BCC/COA/Merritt There appears to be some confusion about the delineation of functions and responsibilities between the District and the colleges. During the team visit, <mark>this issue kept coming up as questions about processes</mark> were asked. The District needs to establish a <mark>clear delineation of functions and responsibilities that are consistently</mark> applied across all colleges. The District and colleges can then work together to document the workflow and communication processes that ensure the District, and the colleges adhere to the delineation in practice. Functional maps provided as evidence in ISERs were different between three colleges and one college. (IV.D.2)

Laney The Chancellor ensures colleges receive effective and adequate services to support the colleges in achieving their missions through board policies and administrative procedures. The district provides centralized information technology, human resources, fiscal affairs, and research and planning services to the colleges. The district holds a Planning and Budgeting Integration Model summit and program review process annually to inform allocation of

resources. Delineation of functions is evident through college functional maps, however, there is no consistency on which operational responsibilities and functions are owned by the district, colleges, or are shared functions. (IV.D.2).

All 4 colleges - The District and the Colleges work together to ensure planning and evaluation is integrated to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness. A crosswalk was created that aligns college strategic goals to district strategic goals and then to the State Chancellor's Vision for Success goals. This crosswalk has been used by the district and colleges to guide their strategic plan development. The district and colleges follow board policies and administrative procedures for institutional effectiveness and annually assesses goals and progress at the annual Planning and Budget Integrated Model summit. The last approved strategic plan was completed in 2015. The board is currently revising their mission and a stop gap strategic plan to provide guidance to colleges for planning. Once the District establishes a clear and consistent delineation of functions in Standard IV.D.2, the team suggests that the participatory governance process, workflow, and communication be documented to better support integrated planning and evaluation. (IV.D.5)

All 4 colleges - The Peralta Community College District utilizes a number of district-level participatory governance committees and standing operational groups to facilitate two-way communication between the district and colleges. Communication also occurs through districtwide administrative meetings such as the District Administrative Leadership Team and Manager Meetings. Other parts of the structure include the Planning and Budgeting Integrated Model 55 (PBIM) as well as a number of district-wide planning committees. The District includes timely and accurate information and updates in their Peralta Gems weekly newsletter and through districtwide emails and utilizes its webpage and social media for external communication. College presidents regularly communicate to the Board on issues of student success and other items of institutional importance. Through reports at college governance committees and regular written communications, college presidents ensure that college constituencies are well informed of district matters and are able to provide college perspectives through two-way communication. Once the District establishes a clear and consistent delineation of functions in Standard IV.D.2, the team suggests that a communication process and strategy be created to ensure effective operation of the colleges. (IV.D.6)

All 4 colleges - The District evaluates role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes annually through the Planning and Integrated Budget Model summit. As a result, recent changes to improve services were made including the decentralization of Financial Aid, the coming decentralization of Admission and Records and the reconstitution of the Legal Department. These evaluation outcomes were communicated widely through reports at board meetings and in shared governance district wide committees. The team suggests the district formalize the outcome evaluation process once a clear and consistent delineation of functions is completed in Standard IV.D.2. (IV.D.7)