

2013 Delineation of Functions Review Results and Further Reviews

1. Background

At the conclusion of the 2007 Accreditation site visits, one of the recommendations from ACCJC stated that “The district and colleges should collaborate to implement a process to regularly evaluate the delineation of functions and widely communicate those findings in order to enhance the college’s effectiveness and institutional success. (Standard IV.B.3.g)”.

To respond to the ACCJC recommendation, the three Colleges incorporated a Function Map - developed and adopted by the District Accreditation Coordinating Council (DAC) based on the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) policy directives (Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions In Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts of Systems, dated 2004 and 2012). One of its purposes is to illustrate how the three Colleges and the District manage the distribution of responsibilities by function. The Function Map was reviewed by the District Shared Governance Council (now called District Participatory Governance Council) in April 2007 and was later adopted by the Chancellor’s Council. Further, in 2008, the District Colleges developed the necessary process and timelines to conduct evaluation of the delineations of functions and to communicate the findings widely to the District Colleges (see document: Delineation of Functions Process for Evaluation, dated 2008). The process calls for the Colleges and the District to review the Delineation of Functions every three years with the first round of review commencing during spring 2010. The review is guided by the Delineation of Functions Review Committee (DFRC). See membership of this committee toward the end of this document.

Since then, the Function Map has been reviewed two times, most recently in 2013. The 2013 review is based on the Function Map that contained approved changes to the map from the spring 2010 district-wide review.

2. Findings from the 2013 Review by Sites

All four (4) sites (Cañada College, College of San Mateo, Skyline College and District Office) reviewed the Function Map based on the approved process and

San Mateo CCD Delineation of Functions (2013)

timelines. Feedback from various constituents was pooled by the respective DFRC member representing the site or the executive staff in District Office.

Canada College's Planning Council, Instructional Planning Council & Student Services Planning Council, and Academic Senate all reviewed the functional map. DFRC received feedback from these constituent groups at Cañada College:

The Student Services Planning Council (SSPC) commented in general that the District and College's roles have been functioning well. SSPC suggested the following sub-standard in Standard III to be changed to SHARED: III 4.4.a., III 4.b. and III 4.c.; IIIC.1.c; and III D.2.2a through 2.f.

The College's Academic Senate reviewed the functions and inquired if the following sub-standards in Standard III may be changed to SHARED: III.C.1.c, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.c, and III.D.2.d

College of San Mateo constituency representatives approached their respective groups to review and provide feedback. The faculty, administration, classified staff, and the Associated Students had no recommended suggestions. The map was also reviewed at College Council meeting.

Skyline's various constituent groups reviewed the Function Map separately before bringing it back to the College Council. The groups were the academic senate, classified council, student senate, and management council. The College Council acknowledged the review and left the document as is at its April 2013 meeting.

District Office - The map has been reviewed by the District Office personnel. There were only a few questions for clarification and no recommendations for change.

3. Missing Sections and New Sections

Three sections in the original Function Map developed in 2008 were missing in the document circulated for review in 2013 due to a clerical error. They were Standard I.B, 5, 6, and 7. See Table 1 below. In Section 4, Colleges are requested to review these two sections.

The accreditation standards published by ACCJC in 2006 underwent changes with a new version of the standards published in 2012. Since then several new sub-standards

have been added in Standard 3.D.3. See Table 2 below for details. ACCJC required that Colleges adopt the new changes as they review their function maps.

4. Chancellor’s Council on Recommended Changes and Need for Further Reviews

In June 2013 the Chancellor’s Council considered the comments, suggestions and rationale regarding the Function map as suggested by the Colleges’ participatory government process. The Council reviewed the definitions and purpose of the Function Map as well as the current organizational structure and came to the consensus that no changes were needed. Additionally, the Executive Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services made recommendations as to the designation of responsibilities for the new sections. In the spirit of the continuous nature of the review process, Colleges will review the functions for the new and missing sections in the August/September timeframe.

Table 1 contains the missing sections from the spring 2013 review.

Standard I.B.	College	District
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

Table 2 contains the recommended delineations to the new sub-standards.

Standard III.D.	College	District
3. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability.	S	P
a. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and develops contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.	S	P

San Mateo CCD Delineation of Functions (2013)

b. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.	<i>S</i>	<i>P</i>
c. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations.	<i>S</i>	<i>P</i>
d. The actual plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is prepared, as required by appropriate accounting standards.	<i>S</i>	<i>P</i>
e. On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.	<i>S</i>	<i>P</i>
f. Institutions monitor and manage student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements.	<i>S</i>	<i>P</i>

8. Continuous Improvement Process

The main purpose of reviewing the existing delineation of functions is for the Colleges and the District Office to assess the effectiveness of the functions distributed throughout the District. In particular, the third element of the ACCJC policy (see page 1) states “3. Institutions have the responsibility to describe and display clearly the particular way functions are distributed in their unique multi-college organization. These must be ongoing communication between the college and the district/system regarding the distribution of these functions. The Commission will use this description to identify the locus of responsibility for the institution’s ability to meet accreditation standards (p.72)”

Based on the procedures laid out by ACCJC in the above policy, the District Colleges have developed the Function Map and used it as part of the institution’s self-evaluation. The map itself has been formally reviewed twice during which discussions

San Mateo CCD Delineation of Functions (2013)

among the constituent groups and between the District Office and Colleges have occurred. The document is also part of the self-evaluation process. The document is developed along the line of all the standards and sub-standards and reflects how the District and Colleges have organized their respective roles and responsibilities. The Function Map is part of the ongoing day-to-day operations and will remain so going forward.

DFRC will continue guiding the Function Map evaluation activities among the District Office and the three Colleges. The Delineation of Functions reflects the spirit of continuous improvement. When a function has clearly undergone changes between regularly scheduled reviews, the Delineation of Function is updated and broadly communicated to the Colleges and the District Office.

San Mateo CCD Delineation of Functions (2013)

Documents:

[Approved Delineation of Functions Process](#)

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

[Notes from Function Review Committee meeting \(April 12, 2010\)](#)

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

[Notes from Function Review Committee meeting \(May 6, 2013\)](#)

[Notes from Function Review Committee meeting \(June 3, 2013\)](#)

***DELINEATION OF FUNCTION REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

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

Jennifer Hughes, Vice President, Student Services/ALO, College of San Mateo (co-chair)

Jing Luan, Vice Chancellor, Ed Services & Planning/District ALO (co-chair)

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