**Minutes of Accreditation Steering Committee**

**10-27-11**

**Members Present:** Gayle Berggren, Maribeth Daniel, Ann Holliday, Richard Kudlik, Rick Lockwood, Margaret Lovig, Bob Nash, Christine Nguyen, Vince Rodriguez, Wendy Sacket, Jorge Sanchez, Cheryl Stewart, Lois Wilkerson

**Members Absent:** Lori Adrian, Darian Aistrich, Ted Boehler, Dave Cant, Tarez Henderson, Dan Jones, Nancy Jones, Bill Kerwin, Vinicio Lopez, Laurie Melby

Surveys: Jorge Sanchez gave an update on the number of surveys that have been completed by respondents so far. There are 435 surveys completed by students out of approximately 7,000 students; there are 110 military responses out of 1,500 military students. There are 14 responses out of 43 full-time faculty surveys, and 48 part-time faculty surveys returned out of approximately 350 sent. There are 59 employee surveys returned (classified and administrators). Jorge will send out a reminder email on Friday to complete the survey. It was decided that questions to incarcerated students could be asked during the Distance Learning program review. Ann suggested that faculty members could be asked to remind their students to complete the survey. Gayle said she would request that Donna Lubanski send out an email on Friday morning to faculty.

Jorge said that approximately 25% of the student items were incomplete, and Lois Wilkerson said that she had heard from students that they weren’t completing the survey because it was too long. Gayle said that the student survey was split into two groups (one group answered questions on instruction and educational programs, the other on technical, learning, and physical resources). There was no difference in response rates between the two versions of the surveys. Jorge mentioned that Survey Monkey requires that respondents be given the opportunity to “opt out,” of all future surveys from Survey Monkey; this could be detrimental to our surveying efforts in the future.

District Accreditation Meeting: Lois Wilkerson reported that Interim Vice-Chancellor Andreea Serban has called a District meeting on November 4 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m., to be held in the Chancellor’s Conference Room. She has asked vice-chancellors Dunn and Hirsch to respond to previous recommendations from 2007 that relate to the District. They are inviting the Standards that are affected by those recommendations, or that have Standards that need to coordinate responses. They aren’t telling us how to write it, but they want to address the District’s responsibilities. There were no issues for Standard 2, but they are welcome to attend.

Identification of Evidence Needed from the District: Gayle asked whether the team needed any documents from the District for their work; she would request it on November 4th. Vince Rodriguez responded that the Board had done a self-assessment and we should obtain a copy in order to reconcile it with the opinions of faculty and staff.

Gayle announced that Andreea had provided her with a link to the District 2020 plan; it is now available on the Dashboard.

Gayle stated that she had been trying to locate an “Ethics” resolution. (Standard IIIA1d: The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.”

Richard Kudlik Stated that the Board has an Ethics code for its own behavior, but that there is no code of ethics for employees, and they should have one.

Report from Cheryl Stewart about Service on Recent Accreditation Team:

Cheryl visited a school that was requesting to change from a center to a school; it was part of a larger district. They did a regular team review. She got some good ideas for how to organize online evidence. Some of their claims/supporting documents were weak. Sometimes the links to the documents were incorrect so they had to search for the reference document when they got to campus.

The team starts to read the report six weeks in advance. The college relied heavily on student and faculty satisfaction surveys to support their claims that they were meeting the Standards, which is a little weak. They were missing measureable data. They need the researcher to be part of the team to do quantitative research and to organize the right kinds of data, guiding the analysis and drawing the correct conclusions.

The team had 16 people. This seemed like overkill because it was a small center. The recommendations from the Accreditation teams relate to “Do you meet the Standards all of the time?” The college also depends on the District doing their job right. The teams are not looking to criticize the schools, but they are validating the school’s claims, which must meet or exceed the Standards. It is a positive approach. The team looks for gaps and they can try to help the school. Their goal is to help us.

Discussion of Obstacles in Collecting Evidence/and Suggestions for Success:

Standard 1/Mission and Institutional Effectiveness: Bob Nash: Nancy Jones and Michael Warner are working on sub-parts 3 and 4 of the Mission; Bob is doing 1 and 2. Vince is doing Institutional Effectiveness. They are using documents and minutes and have so far not interviewed anyone. It was suggested that they could interview experts who have served on the Planning Committee for a summary of how the Mission review has been working and gather the supporting documentation as the validation of the process the college has used. Expert members stated that the Mission is reviewed every year by the MPB committee. In 2011 it is being reviewed with a newly formed planning committee, then by all constituents. There were a couple of years when it was reviewed, but it didn’t change. Last year we didn’t change it, because we were waiting for the EMP to be completed.

Bob asked whether the survey included the new mission? The answer is that the “new” mission is still in the proposal stages. The process is important. All planning processes should link to the mission.

Standard 2/Library Resources: Cheryl Stewart said that the committee has met and they have split up assignments. They are going to use the old self study for a template and update it. Student support is strong for this Standard. Cheryl is recruiting other people to assist with her with this Standard.

Cheryl stated that Laurie Melby is doing OK; she has recruited a couple of extra people to assist her with the China section. Cheryl stated she received a useful handout regarding what teams look for when they visit a Center, and she will give it to Gayle and Laurie.

Gayle reported that on Tuesday she, Laurie Melby, Margaret Lovig, Joycelyn Groot, and Vince Rodriguez participated in a conference call with Susan Clifford of the Accrediting Commission regarding a new contract that the contract education department is working on. Dr. Clifford stated that we would need to submit a substantive change proposal (a mini-self study that shows how the new program and site meet ALL the Standards) since the proposal, to offer ESL, and then eventually general education courses leading to an AA degree in Hanoi, Vietnam, is substantially different than anything we are doing now. This report would need to be developed and submitted 30 days before March 12, 2012. Joycelyn will also need to discuss the concept with the Senate, Planning, and Budget Committees.

Dave Cant/Physical Resources: Dave has missed both the Steering Committee meetings. Christine will check in with Dave and help him coordinate Physical Resources.

Ted Boehler/Technology Resources: Ted Boehler was not present; Gayle will follow-up. Margaret pointed out that our EMP doesn’t have a technology plan; it is supposed to be written. There was a survey. [We said at the last meeting that Jorge would put the survey data on the Institutional Effectiveness website so team members would have access to findings.] There is a District technology plan in the 2020 Plan, but it is NOT an “Instructional” technology plan. This needs to be addressed by this committee.

Standard 3/Human Resources: Richard Kudlik missed the training meeting and is behind; he will get his team together soon.

Standard 3/Financial Resources: Rick Lockwood was appointed to take Christine Nguyen’s place, but he was not made aware that he was supposed to be the chair. Cheryl Stewart volunteered to update him and get him up to speed. Gayle will send him the training materials.

Standard 4: Ann Holliday reported that the co-chairs have been meeting and organizing their plan of attack; after the November 4 District meeting, the final team assignments will go out. ASG President Tarez Henderson is serving on their Standard and will assist with the student perspective. Ann estimates they will be able to turn in their first draft around November 8 or 9 for both sections A and B.

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be Thursday, November 17, 3:30-5 p.m**.,** in the President’s Conference Room, College Center, at which time we will discuss at least one draft, including their planning agendas. Future dates for the rest of the year (in the President’s Conference Room) are Thursdays (3:30 – 5:00): December 1, and December 15.