Accreditation Steering Committee

September 1, 2011   4:00 – 5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Attendees: Valerie Karnes, Solomon Rajaratnam, Corey Marvin, Matt Crow, Tammy Kinnan, Loretta Christiansen, Mick Gleason, Jill Board, Suzie Ama

1. **Review of minutes** – approved as submitted. There question regarding Next Step in the self-study. Minutes do not reflect any in between.

2. **Timelines** – we are not through summer and now the deadlines are real. What will the timelines look like? The descriptive summary is due at the end of the month. Standard leaders need to contact their groups and submit something by September 26th for review by the steering committee.

3. **Guidance on how to move forward** - Drafts of descriptors are due at end of Sept and reviewed. How does this groups wish to provide input into the final drafts at the end of September? Suzie recommends line by line. Maybe have standards swap drafts and review. Would it be more effective and better use of time to know that the information should be submitted by 9/26. Individually read come back discuss and get clarification. Would we find a consensus from those who read them? Committee members would be held responsible for printing, reviewing, making comments, and coming to next meeting prepared. Should we consider several two or three hour meetings to break up the process? We will determine what is missing, not word smithing, returned to chairs for corrections prior to final submission. Possible to combine standards (1 & 4), work on three, and then work on two which is lengthy. Schedule two Thursday meeting that are two hours in length. Another possibility is to make the meeting three hours on two separate days. Work on standards 1, 3, and 4 on one day and then standard 2 the next. Possible dates are Sept. 29, Oct 6 & 13. College Council is September 22 and October 20, BOT October 6 in Porterville. October 13th is the Strengthening Student Success Conference. Jill proposed working on Friday's. Schedule Thursday evening and Friday morning, September 29 & 30. We can adjust time accordingly. This works well since the standards will have more time to work on the feedback given.
    It is possible the standards will change because we will be doing some things differently and we may wish to put them in place. Do we write the description and keep things static or do we make targeted revisions based on what is happening. Jill recommends that we write based on what we are doing, and if she learns something different she will share that after next week.
    Did we determine what we are doing to publicize the document? Minutes from previous meeting indicated that President Board would do some additional research. Jill does not feel that posting it as Dr. Post recommended is the way to go. The community and student input is valuable, it could be conducted via focus groups. But she does not remember ever going out and soliciting feedback from the community. Valerie remembers that we asked for community feedback the last time via the internet. We have multiple focus groups that the college is working with. Jill will check with Jack Pond for the appropriate process of gathering community input.

Set aside April for focus groups, gathering information, advisory groups through CTE, and marketing.
The Board of Trustees also reviewed the document prior to the final submission – reviewed during the summer.

We received notice over the summer that terminology has changed. Self-study will be called self-evaluation along with other changes.

Descriptive summary, self-evaluation, and action plan are essentially done all at the same time.
Corey questioned the timeline for internal and external feedback being done at different levels. Shouldn't we conduct this process at the same time? Jill believes that Corey will receive an overlay of dates which will change our dates. Jill believes that in the spring of 2012 we will be doing a great deal of sharing of information that may have been left out, formatting will be done. Who is commenting – internal, district wide participation, and then out to the communities? Then somehow it all becomes one voice.

Final document due in August.

This meeting was to touch back on timeline, remind everyone of deadline at the end of the month. If you are a standard leader this is the crunch time.

Any questions? Otherwise we will be looking forward to September 26th. We may wish to alter the timeline; we missed the spring deadlines, or possibly work the timelines differently. That is the type of feedback that Corey should share with Jane Harmon through the VP meetings.

4. **Adjournment** – 4:55 p.m.

Accreditation Steering Committee
September 29, 2011
MB 212
4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

AGENDA

I. **Minutes and Action Items**

II. **Routing Descriptive Summaries**

III. **Possible Additional Standard Committees**

    a. **Themes**

        i. **Institutional Commitments**

        ii. **Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement**

        iii. **Student Learning Outcomes**

        iv. **Organization**

        v. **Dialogue**

        vi. **Institutional Integrity**

IV. **Distance Education**

V. **Data**

VI. **Style Sheet**

VII. **Ground rules for today**

Accreditation Steering Committee

September 29, 2011   4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Matt Crow, Tammy Kinnan, Loretta Christiansen, Suzie Ama, Heather Ostash

Accreditation process needs to be broad based. Often we are feeling like a bunch of people sitting in the room.

What is it going to take to send this out? It is easy to keep moving to the back burner. The committee needs to create an opportunity to be involved in dialogue regarding the document. We need a variety of people in the room. We need to really discuss the accreditation process, involving real dialogue would mean engaging specific people who would be involved in the input.

Has today and tomorrow been worthwhile to get something out for review and specific input? We will spend October and November to convene the appropriate committees to present the document and obtain feedback.

We could consider focus groups and present the document. But attendance is voluntary and not likely to have good attendance. Maybe carve out one hour of Curriculum and Instruction Council (CIC) and present information and obtain the feedback. Standard Chairs would facilitate the conversation with the groups. Accreditation steering committee should have 2 co-chairs, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Academic Senate President. Focus groups meetings would consist of one co-chair and maybe the standard chair.

Grassroots involves all aspects of the college staff. We obtain information from the groups who are knowledgeable in the area and then have an opportunity to provide input. The multiple layers of review will include all areas.

We have been using the same approach purely out of default and accreditation has changed and the goal has moved. We need to find a way to broaden the feedback and the dialogue.

Accreditation should be a standing agenda item on every participatory governance committee, not just during accreditation.

Question - how should this group approach this process – expanding the process so it is more encompassing? Developing chart with levels of review, scheduling meetings will facilitate the process. The next steps would be to schedule those meetings and an email from the president indicating the importance of the meetings.

It was recommended that we use a timeline the entire process and work backwards. Accreditation document is due to the Board of Trustees in July 2012. We will need to submit the report in May or June.

Should this committee be looking at the themes of the document? Maybe that is the function the steering committee could serve. When we review document we are going to review document anyway, it seems like foundation stuff already done and we will be looking at the integration. Evaluations summaries need to be complete. Theme analysis is reviewed after the descriptive summaries are written. Writing the descriptive summary and the evaluation at the same time would also be a good idea. Once we have the descriptive summary and evaluations would provide

Focus groups in October and November, work over December drafting the evaluation tweaking and bringing two pieces together.

This will coincide with other documents which are due. Beginning to see where the standard committee should be involved.

Evaluation will be written by the focus groups.

Need to determine whether or not the standards are ready to go out to the focus groups. They need to be consistent and at what point do we want to talk about consistency. Consistency in the level of detail will be important.

Accreditation Steering Committee

September 30, 2011   8:00 – 12:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Matt Crow, Tammy Kinnan, Loretta Christiansen, Suzie Ama, Heather Ostash, and Jill Board

We need to solidify the committee makeup. Find a process and stick to it. We also need to gain a commitment from those on the committees.

Steering Committee Makeup

President – yes

Vice President, Academic Affairs - yes

Vice President, Student Services - yes

~~IT Manager – no~~

~~CIC Chair – no~~

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Coordinator – yes

Academic Senate President – yes

Faculty – Career Technical Education - yes

Faculty – Student Services - yes

Faculty - yes

Classified – CSEA President & Administrative Assistant to VPAA as scribe - yes

Student Representative – yes

Community members (2) – yes

Should we have the Director of Admin Services on this committee? It makes more sense to have the Director of Admin Services on the committee in place of the Dean of CTE.

Possibly have a fifth standard that strictly looks at the themes of the standards, and the co-chairs would be the VPAA and AS President.

Committee Make up discussion
President
VPAA
VPSS
Director Admin Services
Dean CTE
AS President
SLO Coordinator
Faculty Member - CTE
Faculty Member - General education
Faculty Member - student services
CSEA President
VPAA AA - scribe
Student
Community members (2)

If we do not have standard 5 then we will be able to drop site director and a faculty member.
Co-chairs of the steering committee would be VPAA and AS President
Do we need to include the IR? Probably not the best use of their time to serve as a member, but will use as a resource.

We need to find faculty members from general education and student services.

ACTION ITEM - Matt will work on finding faculty members to serve.

After reflecting on last night's exercise Corey believes we are looking at the standards too closely. We need to answer the questions to see whether the standard gets to what is asked or if it is off and/or missing something. Spot check each section and determine if complete or missing something.

Identify the central point for each standard then read the copy to see it gets at the central point.

ACTION ITEM – Tammy will add Lisa Fuller back to the steering committee and Standard IV.

Site director – Jill unsure about not having Dean CTE vs director. The site director is the liaison of all facets that has breadth and not necessarily the depth of the college as a whole; they are specific to their sites. Every Dean and VP is expected to see all at scale, directors are expected to see the needs of the center they are responsible for. It may be better option to have the site director on the themes standard. Valerie remains on standard III. Maybe Gale should be moved to co-chair of standard III. Standard II should be a larger committee makeup and believes one additional student services representative would be beneficial. Sandra is wondering why Jill is serving as one of the standard co-chairs

VPSS & Faculty – Standard I

VPSS/VPAA & Faculty - Standard II (include Paula Suorez - member, CTE Dean – member, SLO Coordinator - member)

Director Administrative Services & Faculty – Standard III (remove CTE Dean as member)

President & Faculty – Standard IV

VPAA and AS President – Theme Standard (IR, SLO Coordinator, site director)

Heather would move from co-chair on standard II and remain as a member. Heather would then become the co-chair of standard I. Valerie would take over co-chair as standard II with Suzie and we would include additional membership from student services.

After we determine the standards are complete and include all requirements. They will go to various groups for review and feedback. College council should look at this entire take to respective groups obtain feedback and bring back to college council.

We discussed taking one hour of an established committee meeting directly engaging and obtaining feedback from those groups. It would provide feedback for

ACTION ITEM – Plan focus group meetings for ESCC Bishop, Mammoth, and KRV during October – December.

How would the students like to be involved? Maybe a lunch for the e-boards get them descriptions and call out which on the sit on and pay close attention to standard II give specific questions to think about as they read. They will have greater understanding of how we see ourselves and what we do. These are all important in preparation for the visit. Faculty need to support this process. These meetings could be conducted during college hour through a series of meetings and include lunch as an additional incentive. Tuesday & Thursday during college hour during the spring for the IWV site.

Firm up committee; identify specific days to conduct the meetings. Friday seems to work the best. Have expectation of Flex Friday once a month. Clearly established and we will set a time and meet at that time. Once complete here we probably won't be meeting as a group until late November.

ACTION ITEM: Solidify committee make-up and schedule monthly meetings on Flex Friday from 8:00 – 12:00.

Where do we go from here – yesterday the way we were approaching this was far to detailed. We should pull back on level and look to see if descriptive summaries have what they need. Standard II met and talked about what each standard was looking at then used that as the bases to determine what distinguished one standard from the other.

Needs to reflect where we have been for the past six years. Don't spend a great deal of time discussing where we have been, but it is important to represent where we have been. Pick up the story where we ended three years ago. At what point to do look at last times action plan? In the spring discussions took place regarding this. The co-chairs need to be very familiar with the accreditation documents. We need to put together binders

At what point to do look at last times action plan? We did action plans and stated that was what we were going to do. This is how we got off of warning status. The action items need to be addressed. In the description – if in 2006 in report there was action item listed – this would be substandard 2B with a

response of what we did. In description you will include reference document or indicate the item is no longer relevant.

ACTION ITEM - Tammy will find the action plans from three years ago and provide to Corey.

Previous year's action plans should be addressed in separate area, but your description should report how we go about making sure we are dealing with those goals.

It would not hurt to have the standard chairs review all of accreditation documents.

Next meeting – October 7, 2011 12:00 – 4:00. Tammy will send out email invitation.

Walking through accreditation standards, the entire doc needs faculty chair input, but these areas are specific to the chairs. You have descriptive summaries and the guide to write the standards. Provides the questions that should be responded.

II.A.1. Heather and Suzie are co-chairs for standard II. Themes that are identified by ACCJC. No word smithing purely for content. Distance Ed is a big piece that we need to address as well. Feedback on how we are doing and where we are at. Providing the co-chairs with input reflecting what you believe would be most critical for each area would be beneficial. The revised document would be submitted to ensure that you input was included.

They are looking at our programs to ensure that we are offering the programs in coordination with the mission. There is also the opportunity to include the backup data. It would be best to reflect the mission in the document. There are numerous revisions from the previous document as we have changed over the course of the years. Any changes or recommendations to the quality and integrity of our programs? There was discussion regarding the use of the term integrity.

II.A.1.a. Reflect the AUP process, information on anything that resulted in a change on student assessment – examples of student outcomes and assessments has resulted in a change. English 102 is a good example greater in emphases in accomplishing the objects of the class. Spanish grammar classes 101 & 102 listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills that must all be included as the language learning skills. Stories belong in the evaluation piece more so that the descriptive summary. Better assessment and preparation of students heading into online classes. Assessing student computer skills, are students being placed appropriately. Use of A+ Advancer to assist in the number of Basic Skills courses they must complete – how well it helps with acceleration.

II.A.1.b. What was the reason for offering online vs on-ground. Science is revising curriculum to include the on ground lab. Work experience is also an issue since the district does not have a formal agreement on file. We do have internships and externships available. Is there anything offered online or iTV that has not changed due to it not working. Child Development will be looking into a few of their offerings. This gets at the ongoing program review and looking at the strategies and approach, and not just blindly offering courses. Child Development no longer offers iTV courses as administration does not support the instructor travel to each campus at least twice per semester. Reason was best practices and costs. It is an issue with the mode of delivery.

II.A.1.c. Suzie explained the new flow chart on page 10,

II.A.4. Pull standard language from Title V, standard area of emphasis. Each program really does have an 18 unit area of emphasis.

II.A.6. CIC program revisions are being us in line with the accreditation standards. Syllabi are completed and turned in each semester. Any missing information, such as the diversity statement, can be addressed. The administration can, according to the contract, request copies of the syllabi. Faculty members are not required by contract to forward this information unless requested.

II.A.6.a. Nothing currently in course description that provides SLO's. Communication with the department chairs would need to take place to ensure the compatibility. TMZ, CID's, and other assessment tools will help. How does this group feel about course to course articulation with the ACE recommended courses which is relevant to our veterans population. We should move in this direction, in fact we already do this.

II.A.6.b. We currently do not have a formal process for program discontinuance, and to minimize the impact of students. Catalog rights have changed to be unlimited for students who are continually enrolled. The only catalog rights that exist in ed code are for CSU. We are only community college with a one year limit on catalog rights. The student cannot have a break in enrollment. Otherwise, they pick up with new catalog. Heather has been advocating for deactivation as opposed to deletion. If not on our state inventory we cannot list the students as completions.

II.A.6.c. Recommended that the syllabus information accurately reflect the contract.

III.C.1.

Accreditation Steering Committee

February 6, 2012

Been a while since we last met.

Timeline status – reaching the wall, any room built in now gone. Timelines are now stringent.

We have descriptions self eval and action plans.

Self eval and action plans due on Feb 15th moved to 20th. ALO workshop discussions regarding how long each section should be. Descriptors very long – where we explain what we are doing. Self evaluation piece can be shorter. Self-evaluation not talking about long reams of stuff. Paragraphs are good. Don't write tons for the self eval. Commandeered 350 for accreditation. Corey would like to meet in 350 in the future. Samples of self-studies and other information has been moved to 350. Long descriptions, shorter self eval, and shorter action plans for the two samples we have. If you have identified something that you are now fixing it should not become an action plan. The team will know to look for things that you have found and are currently working on to fix. Some of our actions plans for standard 4 are the evaluation processes. No need to write a ton of different action plans throughout the document. Instead find the appropriate place to place the action item that will address the necessary action. We want as few action plans as possible and bundle them when possible. Where in the writing should the responses be addressed for 2006 and 2009 action plans. We need to provide a consolidated response on the previous plans. Jill has seen a copy of BC and PC standard 4. They listed the previous action plans and addressed them accordingly and included the appropriate evidence. The committee will read the previous report, mid-term report and will what we have addressed. After standard 4 we need to include updated information on previous action plans. The document needs to be user friendly and easy for the team members to review. Each standard will have it written section where the previous action plans and previous recommendations are addressed. If description does not reflect what we are doing in the self-evaluation we need to call that out. If not already familiar with 2006 recommendations and 2009 self-evaluation you should become familiar with the appropriate standard. How would the chart form work, would the language be the same as in the descriptor? How would the cross referencing look? Jill will share reports with Corey from other colleges.

Who will edit the document? Corey and possibly the themes committee. We need to agree on a standardized format for the document so everyone is using the same path of structure. Can this group look at sample accreditation documents? If the document is public then there is no issue. Knowing the format of the other colleges in our district would be good. Still waiting on Standard 1, II C, III A. still outstanding.

Completed document and ready for the board needs to be ready by mid-May for the June BOT meeting. Due to President's office for review early May. April 5th all BOT action items due to President's office. An update from the ALO's was scheduled in April. During the consultation council in January Jane Harmon mentioned the April due date for board review.

Backwards from May – time for public review, and time for final edits, and time for feedback.

Do we want feedback from focus groups on the self-evaluation. Heather believes that the focus groups received both descriptors and action plans.

Time line for getting first draft of self-assessment – due in few weeks. When should final draft be due. Jill believes that the information should be posted on the 20th as planned. It will provide those who choose to provide feedback the time to do so. If out on the 2/24, this will allow 3 weeks for review and feedback. This will allow us to work on the final editing during Spring break. During this time we will decide on final formatting, final editing, and data collecting. The bulk of the committee work will be done with the self-evaluation. Jill reviewed the original timeline and we are right on target. Corey will work with the contact from BC and PC to determine the district wide formatting so we look like one district. We have made great headway with using different services. We need to showcase our college.

Once the document is approved we will have the summer to finalize the formatting and printing. Jill believes we should have a document that looks like one document.

The real concerning part is the deadline of February 20th. As long as you have a plan for getting there. The document will be posted on the website on February 24th for three weeks, back for final editing and to the BOT for the April meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Corey will check with Jane Harmon on the April due date.

In terms of physical look of the document – does this group want input? How do we determine this?

Maybe we should send all three college documents to one editor so they each look the same. Corey will speak with Kate Pluta. We need to collaborate with our sister colleges and determine the best format for all three colleges.

ACTION ITEM: Corey will ask Jane to put on the VP agenda to discuss the format issue.

The simpler it is for the team the better off we are. We also need to work the other colleges to determine the best solution. Ease of navigation is really key for this document. Hyperlinks for the evidence is a very key piece. The evidence needs to be available electronically and in paper form.

Jill was asked where we are with SLO's? CurriCUNET training is scheduled for next week. All old programs have been assessed and new programs are currentluy being assessed. Departments are collecting this data. Each department planned for their courses. Some were due in Fall and some due this spring. When will Jill receive a document that reflects where we are with the SLO assessments. Suzie will write a report this spring so that the accreditation team will have this information. Jill will be asked point blank if we will be placed on warning due to the SLO assessment? We are to be at the level of proficiency. For all institutional, department, and courses. Where are the ILO's housed? They are housed on the SLO assessment moodle. SSESE was used as the data source. Suzie believes we are at the level of proficiency. At the department level we are getting great use of the assessment data. The annual and comprehensive report will provide the detail Jill is looking for. Once assessment report is on a

permanent cycle it will be completed in the fall and will be made available to the public. The assessment committee will review the program review and other areas. They will look for global themes that drive the college. The plan is to have all courses assessed by the end of spring. Heather believes the institutional planning will be the issue for us. We have not had time to evaluate the process. We will likely receive a recommendation. If you cannot assess if the standard has been met, then you should indicate this. The recommendation would address the fact that something needs to happen in order for the team to say the college has truly met the standard. Jill believes that we have made major strides in the right direction on improvement. We have revamped so much, we have not been able to assess everything. The planning and program review will also receive close scrutiny and Corey believes we are most vulnerable in the program review area. They are pressing us to be accurate in where we use our resources. We are building on the previous information for program review, we may not have everything in place or the program reviews completed, but we have made a turn in the right direction to close the loop on program review. Program review is hard work and it should not be taken personally. When resources start following completers, then program reviews will become more important. There will need to be investigative documents.

There are discussions about defining who our students are. When we write about our online program and we justify our online program. We have specific programs that do not serve our core population or the district population. Degree works will help, but it isn't going to be that we changed someone's life that came and took one class and went out and got a job. It will be the certificates and degrees that were awarded through the correct process. We get monies to serve the 18,000 square miles. This is our population. We really struggle with the online program and we are helping the statewide workforce. Should we continue this process? We have lots of dialogue to do in regards to the online program. Online breakdown - 1/3 zip code hours, 1/3 zip code district, 1/3 zip code outside approximately.

Governor Brown would like to drive us to performance based funding. It was FTES driven; now we have other factors through SB 361. It is a new normal and about getting student sin door in appropriate fashion where they come and successfully leave to work force or transfer. Can we still use online to keep us balanced – it will be where we have enrollment productivity, but we need to be strategic about it. We are attempting to define our fate, not just accept our fate. There are discussions about postponing enrollment for those outside of our service area. We know that fulltime students complete. We need to strategically recruit for fulltime students to replace those who are graduating and transferring out. We will utilize our community education programs that will benefit our community that do not have a certificate or degree program path.

Evidence on student achievement list and student learning outcomes, they want to see everything since the last visit. Some conversations about the analysis and how data is being used. Do we know who our students are? Patterns, disconnect with night vs day. Services available at night? The thorough integration of our data is what the team will expect to see. Socio-economic status, disaggregation of data, how is data used. Characteristics of evidence. Any statement or assertion we make should be supported by the appropriate documentation. Document, document, document, reference the evidence. This drives the questions, who you want to interview, and what type of documentation you will use.

For the descriptors the evidence was scattered, we need to standardize and make it consistent. Evidence needs to be gathered. The self-evaluation and descriptors include the evidence in a bulleted list. Keep track of what you evidence is for each piece.

Only listing names without position title on meeting minutes and agendas presents a problem. We can begin the change now for all future meetings to indicate that all groups are represented where necessary.

Heavy emphasis on DE.

Student achievement data and how it ties into the mission of the institution. How are the outcomes tied to this? Program and graduation completion rates. Lots of discussion on the importance of standard 1. A sample will be provided on an outstanding standard 1. This will assist us in the future. Standard 1 has become very important.

College Council will meet on Friday to discuss the vision, mission, and strategic planning.

Accreditation Steering Committee
March 26, 2012
MB 212
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

To be decided:

How long should the document be?

What to put in "Significant Changes Since Last Accreditation Visit"?

Organization of the Self-Evaluation in narrative or chart form?

To be done:

Everyone

1. Read the entire document
2. Makes notes on:
    a. Red-flags--statements made are misleading, over-promising, set in the future, or just plain wrong
    b. Places where evidence is weak or missing (claims are unsubstantiated)
    c. Places where something was not said that could or *should* have been said
    d. Disruptive shifts in language, tone, or focus

Standard Leaders

1. Distribute Revised Drafts to your Standard committees and go over the document one last time,
    a. finalizing any missing sections, pieces, or paragraphs
    b. inserting references for ALL evidence
    c. double-checking Improvement Plans for relevance, unity with the rest of the section (so they don't come out of left field), and measurability
2. Write abstract paragraphs--one for each sub-standard (think community or college newsletter)
3. Get abstract paragraphs back by Monday, April 2nd

4. Get finalized Standards back by Wednesday, April 4th (incorporating comments from ASC's Apr. 2nd meeting)

Corey

1. Finish compiling Introduction (by 4/2)
2. Finish writing Organization of the Self-Evaluation (by 4/2)
3. Finish writing Response to Previous Recommendations (by 4/2, with Jill)
4. Finish writing Eligibility Requirements (by 4/2)
5. Finish writing Policy Statements (by 4/2)
6. Compile Summary of Improvement Plans (4/5)
7. Have Sylvia Post to website (4/5), notify the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor

Accreditation Steering Committee
March 26, 2012
MB 212
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

Down to the bitter end, Corey learned that we do not have to send to the Chancellor until later than originally planned. Thought it would be out to vice chancellor and out to the public by April 6th. Need to hold to the 4/6 deadline. Chancellor will not see until 4/24. There will be mini-accreditation visits with our sister colleges. The three drafts will be shared and mini teams will be created. From reading other colleges you will read document and create questions. Good idea and passing it along will be a good idea. The VP's of the district will make that decision on Wednesday. The committees will be made up of approximately three.
There's some scaffolding in front of the document.

To be decided:

How long should the document be? A good length is 25,000 words according to ACCJC ours is currently 83,000 words. With the additional documents that still need to be added our document will be approximately 300 pages. We do not have a lot of repetition. DeAnza's document was 393 pages. Others are larger. The document needs to be efficient and concrete.

Introduction

Abstract (standards and themes) – none of the standards have anything written yet. The standards only need short abstracts one paragraph each before April 24th. The entire accreditation team is tasked with reading the entire document and responding to everything. It is important that the abstract is specific enough to help gain a comprehensive understanding of the standard. Consider the one or two most important things in the area. SLO's is an example from Standard IIA. Possibly responding to the main question for each standard will incorporate all of the subsections. The themes have been included and may be helpful. The paragraph will be general. **Abstracts due: April 16th**.

Organization of the self-evaluation – can be in chart or narrative form. Inserting the focus group table to show the involvement of all, not just the committee. Any preferences for chart or narrative? Chart is easier to read.

Organization charts and functional maps – coming from HR and Presidents' office.

Eligibility requirements – recently redone for substantive change proposal. After a few revisions these will be included in the next draft. These are the eligibility requirements required to be accredited and continue to maintain. All models that have been reviewed are short.

Response to previous recommendations – Jill and Corey will work on this section.

Institutional Analysis – In past month Corey has reviewed the standards and made recommendations for changes. IA is short and includes the mission statement which is being revised. IB, IIA, IIC, IIIA IIIB, IIIC, revised significantly, IIID really well done and Gale is working on the evidence list, IVA and IVB few minor changes. Corey spent time looking for repeating and pulled together with the information in the appropriate place – pulling things together and avoiding repetition. The other thing was texturizing – themes were identified. Any changes he made were sent out for review and approval. There are a few places where the information is patchy or missing.

Self-imposed deadline – April 6, 2012

Due to Chancellor and Vice Chancellor – April 24, 2012

Hard deadline – May 8, 2012

When do we want post for the community review? April 6th. We need to continue to work on refining the document while we are waiting for feedback from the community. The student survey data will be available around April 13th.

One way to proceed – get as much done as possible and submit to the public on April 6th.

Another – put the current document out to the public and continue to work on the document, shooting for the April 24th deadline. There are some things that are coming later and should be incorporated into the document. Do we indicate where we are right now with student assessment? Yes – indicating the progress we have made, the snapshot will be of this minute. We will provide the plan we have posted,

Evidence – how do we want this listed? Corey recommended that the chairs list the evidence by name in the document for now. We do not need actual evidence just reference it in the document. We will collect the evidence over the summer.

We need the standards finalized, evidence listed, and

Policies not addressed in IA

Summary of Improvement Plans - Double check your improvement plans to make sure they are unified with the descriptive summary. If we identified a deficiency make sure the improvement plan is listed. Otherwise it will be caught by the committee. We have not formalized the improvement plan. This should not be a to-do-list. This should be more functional or process to reach the level of improvement.

Prospective writing – look for this in the standards. Acceptable squirrely language is "at the writing of this document . . . ". If we have not made progress on something it should be eliminated or acknowledge that we are still working on it.

ACTION ITEM - Corey on Wednesday ask Jane when we can expect feedback on the document.

What to put in "Significant Changes Since Last Accreditation Visit"?

In last visit in 2000 – 2006 the online program FTE shortfall, and one other shortfall were included. Corey made recommendations:

Growth of Online program

Recession

Nine CIO's in 16 years, four CIO's in 5 years

Interactions with the district office (HR, Business services centralized to provide on ground service but serving district as a whole)

SB 361 budget allocation and internal allocation process

CurricUNET – district purchase for all colleges

IT although not centralized our small college has benefitted from the connection with district IT

Categorical reductions and subsequent workforce reductions

Stronger community presence – building strong relationships with feeder high schools, student clubs,

Hiring Institutional Researcher – data driven decision making – more data available to us than ever before. ODS – when did this become available.

Grants awarded – outside funding resources

Increase of research acquisitions

Organization of the Self-Evaluation in narrative or chart form?

To be done:

Everyone

1. Read the entire document – does the committee believe reading the entire document is a good idea and how much time will be required? Substantial changes between April 24 and May 8 would be problematical. We all need to read the entire document before April 24th. Admin Cabinet of the district will be reviewing all three documents and will have questions. Jill suggests we read it at the same time the public is reviewing the document. We will meet to discuss what we have seen in the report.
    If the final versions are submitted on the 13th can the document be read by the 16th?
    How do the standard leaders want feedback? We are not word-smithing. Submitting notes to the standard chair prior to the next meeting is preferable.
    April 24th due to DO, all changes based on feedback from each other due on April 20th. All final changes due to Corey by 4/23 to be incorporated.
    Read document and provide feedback by April 2nd.

Out to the public – completed sections only or at least acknowledge the sections that are missing with information forth coming.

Feedback due: April 9th

Final final versions due to Corey: April 20th

Due to Vice Chancellor and Chancellor – April 24th

2. Makes notes on:
   a. Red-flags--statements made are misleading, over-promising, set in the future, or just plain wrong
   b. Places where evidence is weak or missing (claims are unsubstantiated)
   c. Places where something was not said that could or *should* have been said
   d. Disruptive shifts in language, tone, or focus

Standard Leaders

1. Distribute Revised Drafts to your Standard committees and go over the document one last time,
   a. finalizing any missing sections, pieces, or paragraphs
   b. inserting references for ALL evidence
   c. double-checking Improvement Plans for relevance, unity with the rest of the section (so they don't come out of left field), and measurability
2. Write abstract paragraphs--one for each sub-standard (think community or college newsletter)
3. Get abstract paragraphs back by Monday, April 2nd
4. Get finalized Standards back by Wednesday, April 4th (incorporating comments from ASC's Apr. 2nd meeting)

Corey

1. Finish compiling Introduction (by 4/2)
2. Finish writing Organization of the Self-Evaluation (by 4/2)
3. Finish writing Response to Previous Recommendations (by 4/2, with Jill)
4. Finish writing Eligibility Requirements (by 4/2)
5. Finish writing Policy Statements (by 4/2) – these are from the federal government policy statements DOE.
6. Compile Summary of Improvement Plans (4/5) – can be done during weekend between 20-24th. Summary of current improvement plans. Are we responding to the previous improvement plans? We can do abbreviated version in chart format. Heather has seen a chart indicting when and how it was completed. Standard leaders need to double check previous action plans and if they have been addressed.
7. Have Sylvia Post to website (4/5), notify the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor

Fix statements that are wrong, misleading, over promising,

Fix issues where claims are not substantiated. Evidence is required.

Find areas that may have been missed.

Avoid disruptive language or tone.

ACCREDITATION DOCUMENT DUE DATES:

Feedback due - April 9th

Abstracts due - April 16th

Final Final versions due - April 20th

To Chancellor and Vice Chancellor due - April 24th

Evidence must be included by April 24th - follow the format used by Standard IV.