ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 29, 2015
9:00 a.m.–10:30 a.m.
INST 1005

Present: Michael Allen, Cathy Brinkman, Faith Colt, Kelly Enos, Pat Flood, David Garza, Michael Griggs, Sarah Master, Leslie Milke, Deborah Paulsen, Dr. Monte Perez, Joe Ramirez, Zoila Rodriguez-Doucette, Oliva Sanchez-Ayala, Daniel Villanueva

Absent: David Jordan

Support: Carlos Gonzalez, Matthew Lee, Mary Lou Mendoza, Sandy Mine, Darlene Montes, Ludi Villegas-Vidal

Guests: Donna Ayers

Meeting called to order by Kelly Enos, 9:10 a.m.

1. Review Minutes
   - April 15, 2015
     M/S/Approved w/ corrections D. Garza/O. Sanchez-Ayala

2. Self-Evaluation Report
   a. April 23-24 ACCJC conference in San Diego - debrief
      - VP Villanueva will send a PowerPoint from the conference to the committee.
      - There was a discussion regarding the importance of engaging adjunct faculty members in the accreditation process and the life of the campus in general. This is an issue the visiting team will be looking at.
      - The ASC Co-Chairs will create accreditation training for adjuncts to get them involved in the process and also receive some measurable feedback from them.
      - Materials handed out at the conference will be posted on our ASC website.
      - The Quality Focus Essay should include data, timelines, responsible individuals involved, what outcomes can be expected, how they can be measured, and what impact those outcomes will have on the college. In the mid-term report, the college will report on the progress of the items discussed in the Quality Focus Essay.
         o It was unclear at the conference whether the Quality Focus Essay replaces the Actionable Improvement Plans presented in the previous self-report. Dr. Lee submitted a question to the commission asking if and where AIPs are required in the current self-report. The conservative approach would be to create AIPs where there appears to be a need for them.
         o Kelly will create a timeline for the Qualify Focus Essay.

3. ALO’s Report
   a. VP Allen and Kelly Enos will visit with the writing teams to share highlights for each standard that were discussed at the ACCJC conference.
   b. Some general remarks from the conference:
      - Disaggregation of data - the institution can choose how it wants to disaggregate data, as long as it’s shown how the student achievement gaps are being addressed to promote student equity.
      - 7-year accreditation cycle, which starts spring 2016, will have a mid-term evaluation due in the 4th year of the cycle.
      - All employees engaged in student instruction must be evaluated with student learning outcomes incorporated into their evaluation reports. This already occurs during the faculty evaluation process as prescribed by the union contract, however it is not current practice for classified employees directly responsible for student learning (ex: instructional assistants). Michael will work with Danny, Kelly and Dr. Perez to come up with some guidelines for these employee evaluations.
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During the ALO symposium, the commission was asked how an institution can go about getting statistically valid data on job placement in order to meet the new standards. The commission response was that in California, we don’t have the capacity to do that.

Site teams will be looking at the student complaint process. The commission was asked whether there is an expectation of student complaints. It was pointed out that our own process thus far has resolved complaints informally before they escalated into a formal complaint. The question was raised as to what constitutes a complaint. A discussion followed about briefly documenting and logging informal student complaints, including how they were resolved without evolving into formal complaints.

Dr. Lee suggested that just to be cautious, Student Support Services should still demonstrate in their report some contribution to student learning under the new standards. One way of doing this is to do some kind of mapping of the ILOs.

One of the problems from the previous site team visit was that the visitors could not understand the function of the Personnel Commission and its relationship to campus HR. How can this be explained within the space available for the appropriate standard? Dr. Lee suggested describing highlights of how the PC works in the text and refer to more detailed information in the evidence, perhaps in an FAQ format.

There is a 25,000 word limit to each college’s Self-Report. 5,000 words should be reserved for the Quality Focus Essay, and 5,000 should be reserved for input from District. This means that we will be limited to about 15,000 words for our portion of the text.

In July 2015 there will be a new “Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions” published on the ACCJC website. Michael will find out how that will affect institutions such as ours which are being evaluated in 2016.

Writing teams will find the annotated standards posted on our ASC website very helpful.

There was a suggestion that all writing teams meet on a Friday with ASC leadership to help with consistency. Kelly will follow up on this.

We are heading into May and still have a long way to go before we have a good working document for editing. We need to pick up the pace of work and if your team needs assistance, please contact Michael, Danny or Kelly. Summer should be when we are receiving the last bits of evidence and giving the document a unified voice. A concern was expressed that some writing teams are still working on the tables. At this point, each standard should have a reasonably constructed narrative, not necessarily including evidence citations.

Writing teams should remember that the Mission Statement of the college should be the primary driver for all planning and evaluation.

Final drafts are due to ASC by August 19, 2015. The Senate has scheduled November 5, 2015 to review the final draft.

4. President’s Report

Dr. Perez spoke briefly about his experience at the CEO portion of the ACCJC conference, the general theme of which was collaboration.

There was a discussion about the section in Standard IVB regarding the CEO’s primary leadership role in ensuring the institution meets or exceeds accreditation standards and policies.

5. From the Floor

6. Next Meetings
   - May 13, 27
   - June 10, 24

Meeting adjourned: 10:28 a.m.