Present: Michael Allen; James Armstrong; Madelline Hernandez; Sarah Master; Mary Louise Mendoza; Leslie Milke; Darlene Montes; Monte E. Perez; Joe Ramirez; Zoila Rodriguez-Doucette; Dennis Schroeder; Hanh Tran; Daniel Villanueva; Ludi Villegas Vidal; Ronn Gluck
Absent: Cathy Brinkman; Angela Echeverri; Pat Flood; Monica Moreno

Minutes of 11/20/2013 – Approved

1. **Progress Report Writing Team** – Dr. Mathew Lee discussed recommendations on how to maximize a positive outcome from the Accrediting Commission. Dr. Lee distributed and discussed three documents “A Few Suggestions for Accreditation Follow-Up Report Writing”, “Parsed Los Angeles Mission College Team Recommendations with Cited Standards and Eligibility Criteria, March 2013”, and “Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission”.

“A Few Suggestions for Accreditation Follow-Up Report Writing” along with “Parsed Los Angeles Mission College Team Recommendations with Cited Standards and Eligibility Criteria, March 2013” are discussed first.

1. Dr. Lee states that the Follow up report is to be focused on the Recommendations, Standards and Eligibility Requirements that underline the standards. **The primary needs in the Follow-Up Report are Coverage, Accuracy, and Evidence.**

2. Dr. Lee discussed Recommendation 1 example on “Parsed Los Angeles Mission College Team Recommendations.” A distinction has to be made clear in the follow-up report to be considered an established process. Documentation and execution make the distinction an established process. **One must establish a process that is sustainable but also sustain that process by setting a schedule and following it. Standards represent a sound practice; regardless of changed standards in June 2014, the team must still take into consideration that the outcome be a sustainable long term improvement in the institution.** Using the standards and eligibility requirements as a guideline help in assuring future accreditation. Ensure that the process is credible, reasonable and can be concluded that the institution is doing well then document the decision and move on. Dr. Lee expressed his opinion on the word “review” as a synonym for “evaluation”. On every single recommendation the team must parsed down and evaluate if the institution has followed up in the process that is stated. He suggests to break down each recommendation into separate lines to be used as a checklist (see handout). Every one of those “steps” needs to be documented if they are not documented then what is stated did not happen in the eyes of Accreditation.

3. It should be noted that under every Recommendation Dr. Lee has listed the Cited Standards and Eligibility Requirements. The team has focused on the Recommendation language but part of the checklist will be the underlining standards. Training teams are not as consistent and rigorous and sometimes a team will site the last three words of a phrase in a Standard or Eligibility Requirement, and it is the institutions responsibility to be able to cover what is stated. In drafting and reviewing the draft the main point is to make sure the checklist is covered and attention is brought to each of
the underlying standards. The fundamental thing the writing team should focus on is that the institution is now meeting the standard. If the standard is in conflict with the recommendation, you have to meet the standards and make the argument of meeting the standard.

4. In light of the parsed Recommendation, review the evidence you have in hand along with your own knowledge of the issues and actions. Each member of the writing has knowledge on the institution, the core of the writing must be based on evidence but members can include their own interpretation of the evidence based on ones knowledge of the institution. Accuracy is paramount! After final draft is completed, it will be sent out to the campus community and there will be three questions asked 1. Is all the information covered? 2. Is this accurate? 3. Is there any other evidence produced that should be included? Evidence is crucial so as writing is in process the team should include footnotes and references of evidence.

Dr. Lee asked Darlene Montes on the procedure of evidence filing. Evidence is being forwarded to Darlene where she then numbers them with Dr. Perez. Dr. Lee suggested that each paragraph that contains any argument at all will have its own citation referring to the specific evidence, for example if the evidence needed is inside the “Educational Master Plan”, do not cite the entire master plan unless the argument that is made is that you have an Educational Master Plan, if it’s only a piece cite that specific page. Everything you do is to make the Commission team’s job easier for them to understand exactly what LA Mission is doing in respects to the recommendations. Dr. Lee continued by stating the more eyes on the drafts the better off the team is. You will have the best possible report you can create based on the time you have left.

5. Dr. Lee suggested outlining the response. He suspects the Commission uses a more linear approach when evaluating the report. The writing team needs to make it easy for the Commission to be able to read and check off each item. “Use the specified format, but within each section, organize the subsections in logical order to address each issue fully in turn.” Based on writing skills, the team is mapping an evidence based argument and it has to be completely accurate. The team is seeking to persuade the Commission about the level of progress the institution has reached.

6. “Fill in your outline with narrative” Dr. Lee suggests including cited evidence at the end of each applicable paragraph instead of the end of every sentence. Write as concise as possible to convey the point, do not make it longer than it needs to be. Get another member to make sure it is concise. Echo the language of the Recommendation and Standards where the team can. Make the distinction of what has been done and what is scheduled to be done. Stating to “plan to do something” is okay, but institutions on sanction do not get the benefit of the doubt. Instead being firm and still accurate by giving specific dates in the assertions of progress the better it reads to the Commission. Flaws have to be acknowledged in report to show accuracy to the Commission. Achieve a balance of what you have done and what is still needed to be done. Do improvements to benefit the institution in the long run. Refer to the Gap Analysis for preliminary observations on progress.
7. If you do not have the evidence for a given point, make a note of it. Dr. Lee suggested having writing teams physically look at evidence to appropriately cite it. Dr. Lee also suggested when scanning evidence into a pdf scan it as a searchable pdf instead of an image pdf for the writing team to easily search for specific evidence.

8. Work together, if a team encounters evidence that relates to other Recommendations let each other know.

Dr. Lee emphasizes the point that evidence is crucial! Make sure the Commission can find the evidence that is being cited.

Dr. Lee moved on and referred to exerts in “Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission”.

If additional work remains for the future, concrete details, plans, timeline, and outcomes for that work should be included in the report. This is where the team will state specific schedules of the outcomes that have not yet been met for example “we have established the following timeline for complete resolution of this recommendation”. Dr. Lee’s preference having done the analysis is to present a conclusion regarding the resolution of the recommendation. That conclusion would typically start “L.A. Mission College has completely resolved Recommendation 1...” followed by a brief standard and a sentence or two of the high points of what has been completed. In the case of a recommendation that has not been completed, conclusion should read along the lines of “Mission College has partially/ largely resolved this recommendation...” followed by a timeline for full resolution example, “by the end of December we would have fully resolved this recommendation”. Be realistic in timelines and set timelines for full resolution.

Final Remarks:
Through ALO, President, and Board a decision has to be made on how the Report will be presented. Dr. Lee emphasized the importance of accuracy, of evidence, and of coverage. If the team feels comfortable at the end of each draft being able to accommodate each of these marks, then the draft should be in good shape for evaluation.

Once the writing team completes the Report for the recommendation, Michael Allen will receive it and make corrections for appropriate consistency in writing style, Michael will then send drafts to Dr. Lee for review. Dr. Lee will then review evidence, coverage, as well as voice and style consistency. Afterwards Dr. Lee will return the drafts with his suggestions to Michael for first edit, which will then go back to the team for decision of suggested edits. Writing teams should produce close to final drafts before sending it to Michael due to the close time constraints. Make place holders if actions will be completed at later date, documentation is still need with scheduled date but let Michael know to change once the action has been completed.
ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE
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Dr. Lee, Michael Allen, and Madelline will go through the entire report one final time for review. Dr. Lee suggested appointing Michael for final corrections and review of accuracy complete report. Dr. Lee stated there are no suggested guidelines on page limits as long as the information is well written and completely demonstrates a concise compliance with the argument and appropriate evidence. Do not use filler words; get to the point with short but accurate sentences.

2. President’s Report – President Perez reviewed a letter from the Commission stating that the Follow-Up report is to be submitted on March 15, 2014. Dr. Perez will create copies for everyone. President Perez suggested goal to finish Report on March 11th Wednesday Board Meeting. After College Council Retreat on January 28th, 2014 there will be a scheduled time to review the Report with faculty and students. Michael Allen stated that the College Council Retreated will be moved instead to February 4th, 2014. After some discussion it was agreed to review Report as well as approval on Strategic Plan on February 4th, 2014.

3. ALO’s Report – President Perez spoke with the visiting team chair and it was mentioned that he will call during the second week of April during the 7th -13th but due to Spring Break then suggested the latest would be the following week. President Perez agreed. Final decision depends on the team but President Perez strongly suggests the 3rd week of April.

4. Minutes of 11/20/2013 – Approved

5. Accreditation Classified Support – No one has been appointed. Michael Allen will request Susan Ghirardelli for the weekly meetings in the month of January. Over time was suggested to be given for the staff member who will dedicate their time in preparing all tedious duties for ASC meetings. Madelline is to meet with Michael to discuss the issue.

6. Progress Update
   a. Complaint Process – Ludi Villegas updated and discussed the group had set a timeline and are aiming to finish January 10th, 2014 and ready to launch February 10th. Copies of the latest description of the Student Complaint Process along with a map of the process were distributed. Focus was set on the divisions “Student Service”, “Academic Affairs”, and “Administrative Service”. Danny suggested adding “Office of the President”, the group had discussed adding the President through VP Academic Affairs but having a separate drop box will be clearer. In assisting students on choosing the appropriate division for their complaint, Ludi has provided the “Samples of Complaint Categories for Online Student Complaint Process” document to detail the information given to the student online. Complaints against the Sheriffs will be noted under Facilities and other Complaints.

Sarah Master spoke on behalf of Cathy Brinkman who was absent to suggest Cathy’s revisions. She suggested revisions on the “Samples of Complaint Categories for Online Student Complaint Process” under Instructor/Academic Office Complaint by eliminating “Vocational Education Programs” and replacing it with Cal WORKS, Foster and Kinship care, and Career and Technical Education Programs (CTE).
ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE
CC4, 9:30 a.m. – 11:41 a.m.

It was suggested that ITV should be identified as a separate option in the divisions for complaint from the student but will still be mapped to Dr. Perez to contact district.

Hanh Tran suggested changing “Title V”. Dr. Perez stated housing “Title V” complaints under Academic Affairs.

Hanh discussed briefly the process of the Automated System. An online form will be completed by the student who will submit and be tracked by pin number. All complaints will be sent to a master email where it will automatically filter complaints into divisions. Reviewers of those specific divisions will receive notifications through their regular Outlook box. Joe Ramirez predicted a year for students to fully use the online system.

Concerns of having an appointed one person to oversee all complaints but is still in progress and it is suggested for the Joe Ramirez to be appointed to follow up on the complaint if no action was taken. Dr. Perez suggested adding to the agenda weekly meetings addressing the complaints and process. If the complaint is not dealt with at the appropriate time VP s are suggested to take action and assist the situation.

Logging complaints is to be worked on by Hanh and Dennis Schroeder for functionality and formality in documentation for future evaluation. The issue of clearly defining a complaint is still in debate and will have to be formalized to teach students a recommended process.

Dr. Perez stated his opinion on the criteria of logging a complaint. If a student is still unhappy with the resolution of a concern then that is when it should be logged as a formal complaint and further dealt with. Documentation is highly important and necessary.

Danny suggested making the complaint process ADA acceptable as well as including translations for other languages common to Mission’s student body.

Joe Ramirez with the assistance of Dr. Perez are to assemble a proposal on managing concerns, Ludi is to complete the formal complaint process. All is to be emailed to Madelline prior to the January 8th for review by email. Writing will be due on December 16th to Michael.

For the December 20th deadline recommendation 1, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 will have to be submitted to Michael Allen no later than December 16th, 2013.

b. Recommendations/ ERs
c. AIPs
These topics were not discussed but Madelline reminded that summaries will be due and a timeline will be proved via email. If there are any concerns that arise with in the writing teams contact the VP or ASC Co-Chairs. Action plans will be posted on the website and separated by recommendations. A column was added for evidence to assist with citing evidence in the writing.