**Minutes of Accreditation Steering Committee**

**1-12-12**

**Members Present:** Lori Adrian, Gayle Berggren, Ted Boehler, Maribeth Daniel, Betty Disney, Ann Holliday, Dan Jones, Nancy Jones, Bill Kerwin, Vinicio Lopez, Margaret Lovig, Bob Nash, Vince Rodriguez, Cheryl Stewart,

**Members Absent:**, Darian Aistrich, Dave Cant, Tarez Henderson, Richard Kudlik, Rick Lockwood, Laurie Melby, Christine Nguyen, Wendy Sacket, Jorge Sanchez, Lois Wilkerson

Lori distributed the Commission’s *Guide to Evaluating Institutions* document. She asked that it be reviewed and that team members try to gather critical documents as they write and evaluate the college in addition to being sure we meet the Standards.

Lori expressed concern that Gayle is not getting the different sections turned in as quickly as she wanted. According to our timeline, we should be working on our second draft, and we are not even done with our first. A working copy to will need to go to the Board in mid-March. Gayle noted a draft copy also needs to be posted for all-college review.

To ensure that this important work gets done quickly, Lori is requesting that from each Standards team, two people take the lead in getting the writing gathered and finished immediately. The following appointments were made:

**Standard 1: Institutional Mission & Effectiveness**

Vince Rodriguez & Nancy Jones

**Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services**

Vinicio Lopez & Cheryl Stewart

**Standard III: Resources**

Christine Nguyen & Rick Lockwood

**Standard IV: Leadership and Governance**

Maribeth Daniel, Ann Holliday, & Margaret Lovig

Lori also suggested against putting in too many editorial comments; if information is not related to the Standard, don’t put it in. She prefers that we not refer readers to another Standard, that we re-summarize material within each Standard. Visiting readers will be reading the self-study online and it is too difficult to scroll online. Be specific on time frames, such as “every two years.” Every time you describe something, provide the evidence.

The evaluation sections need to start with the statement of whether or not the college meets the Standard.

In the planning agenda, don’t say you want to “continue to improve a process”; this should go in the evaluation section. Only write a planning agenda if we are deficient.

The description section has to be complete. Address only the Standard. That is the research the team needs to do, and refer to the evidence. Refrain from being overly descriptive (don’t add extra information). Gayle pointed out that you do need to provide additional evidence and description so the visiting team can understand the college programs and how the college works.

Gayle said that as she edits, she is formatting the document into the final style, and asked that headers and underlining not be changed. She is working from a style sheet and in time most of the document will become more uniform. It is important that all documents be called the same thing. For some College processes that are repeatedly referred to, such as the Planning Cycle, it might be useful to prepare a stand-alone document that can be linked to in each section where the topic appears.

Presentations of draft Actionable Improvement Plans were made by:

*Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services*

A. Instructional Programs –Vinicio Lopez

B. Student Support Services—Bill Kerwin

*Standard III Resources*

C.     Technology Resources—Ted Boehler

**Draft Due Dates:**

**January 30:** Standards Co-Chair leads complete and review a draft within each Standard Committee; submit it back to the Standard Committee for review.

**February 10:** Standards Co-Chair leads submit a reviewed and edited draft 1 for their Standard to the Accreditation Chair; also send a list of evidence.

**February 16:** Next meeting date: Friday, February 16, 9-11 a.m. (in the 4th Floor Conference Room)

-Accreditation Chair gives feedback from an Accreditation perspective

-View all Actionable Improvement Plans (in one document style)

**March 1:** By this date the Standards Co-Chairs have reviewed the second draft

**Next meeting date:** Friday, February 16, 9-11 a.m. (in the 4th Floor Conference Room)