**Minutes of Accreditation Steering Committee**

**11-17-11**

**Members Present:** Gayle Berggren, Ted Boehler, Dave Cant, Maribeth Daniel, Ann Holliday, Dan Jones, Nancy Jones, Richard Kudlik, Vinicio Lopez, Margaret Lovig, Christine Nguyen, Vince Rodriguez, Cheryl Stewart, Lois Wilkerson

**Members Absent:** Lori Adrian, Darian Aistrich, Rick Lockwood, Tarez Henderson, Bill Kerwin, Bob Nash, Laurie Melby, Wendy Sacket, Jorge Sanchez

**Updates on progress from each Standard**

Standard I—Nancy: reported that the team/Standard has been divided into 4 parts; 1A has been written, but it is not complete. Vince reported that all the team members are working. They will be turning in their drafts to the chairs first. They are still in process, and they have a good start. Vince said the discussion about processes about planning at the PIEAC planning meeting the previous day were very useful to his thinking and writing on this Standard. It helped him to clarify “How do we continually assess” and “How do we assess our measurements.”

Standard II—Vinicio responded that out of 12 members who had signed up to participate on this standard, that there were only six active members; this was making his progress difficult. He has set a date for November 22 when their evidence and materials are due to him, and his rough draft will be submitted by November 29. Cheryl responded that her group (library) is more robust; each person has a section they are working on. They are meeting next week and will have a draft ready to turn in on November 29th.

Cheryl asked about how planning agendas would be coordinated. She pointed out that it was likely that there would be similar planning agendas across Standards. Gayle responded that each area would have an evaluation. Initially each area may write its own planning agendas. Then they will all be reviewed by the Steering Committee, then the PIEAC planning committee. Once vetted, they will be mentioned in the most apropos area of the report, and the message “Please refer to [whichever specific Standard where they reside in the report]” will be used when planning agendas are similar to avoid duplicative text. It was also stressed that not all self-assessments need to have planning agendas.

China-Gayle reported that Laurie Melby has submitted her draft on the China Program. She will make it available for those who need to refer to it in order to write sections of their own reports. The long sections will probably be left as documents to link out to.

Standard III—Technology: Ted stated that through the Technology Committee, surveys, interviews, and etc., the group was up to speed in some areas, but behind in others. They are finding it challenging to locate documentation related to college hardware information. Christine noted that IT has to do an annual physical inventory, and Lois said that One Stop does also. Christine said she would get that information for Ted. He said they need to cover the topics of hardware and environmental scanning. The sections on Seaport and training are OK. Dan has been writing the section of the environmental scan.

Standard III—Human Resources: Richard reported that the Human Resources section has been written and submitted, but he is having difficulty getting his team to participate. Of those who were assigned to this Standard, Sue Primich is the only one willing to work on Human Resources with him (the rest wanted to work on Student Services), but because of her counseling schedule, she needs two week’s notice to schedule a meeting time; she will read and respond to what has been written. Cheryl suggested that faculty and classified employees who understand the implications of staffing (especially in light of the reorganizations) should be assisting Richard with the evaluation of this Standard. There was some discussion about the District faculty hiring plan and how our own faculty hiring plan does not relate to that of the District’s. Cheryl volunteered to assist Richard with the evaluation of his report. Maribeth will find a classified staff person who can serve who has experience, possibly George Santoro.

Standard III--Financial Resources: Christine reported that this Standard has been hard for Rick to coordinate. Since she wrote this section of the self-study the last time, she will draft the description; it will be done by next week, then Rick’s group can review it. Their target date for the final draft is November 30. Richard is assisting with the collection of the evidence.

They are also participating in the development of the District functional map for Financial and Human Resources.

Standard III—Physical Resources: Dave reported he has been meeting with his team through emails; he is writing the draft and the team members will read and provide input. The first draft will be ready the following week. Gary Stromlund is writing the security and safety sections.

Standard IV- Ann reported that she had attended several District meetings related to District relationships. She is willing to write the section on the leadership/college president; she and Lois will be meeting with the president on December 5, and Ann will write it. Ann’s section will be turned in on Dec 5.

The Board is writing an evaluation on its own functioning and their plans for improvement. Dr. Serban said the District-written materials will be ready on December 8.

**Discussion of obstacles in collecting evidence/and suggestions for success**

-Student participation has been sparse; be sure to copy Bill with any information or decisions so he can follow up with them at ASG meetings.

-Mission Plan and Budget minutes from several years back are in notebooks, not digital. Nancy was told to get hard copies and Vince would ask their work-study student to make scanned copies of these minutes so they can be available as documents for the self-study team.

-The question was asked about how we will be uniform in talking about PIEAC and the budget/resource allocation process; there was a concern about being repetitive in describing about budget and planning and institutional effectiveness. It was decided that Nancy will write a thorough explanation at the beginning of the report, and then each Standard can refer to her section so there are no redundancies.

**Coordination with the District/ Standards I, IIIA, IIIB, IIIC, IIID, and IV**

Ann reported on feedback from a meeting at the District. She said in a meeting with Vice Chancellor Andreea Serban, that Dr. Serban stated that she would be writing everything re: the Board and the District. Then we are to incorporate what they have written. Ann pointed out that the self-study is supposed to be in one voice, and would likely be reworded for “flow.” Dr. Serban seemed concerned that we might change her wording. Gayle replied that we could include the “description” that Dr. Serban provides, but each of the three colleges has the opportunity to provide feedback to Dr. Serban, and we also have the chance to write and evaluate the description; each college may have a different experience vis-à-vis the District or the Board. Dr. Serban agrees we may not all agree, and we have the chance to provide feedback to her.

The Board wants to see an early draft in February or March. Gayle has added March to our calendar for delivery of a draft to the Board, the same time as a draft goes to the rest of the college.

Two members from each of the college visiting teams will be included on the District team.

Ann pointed out that Dr. Serban is working to get the Board into compliance in the areas of the Accreditation recommendations that the colleges received in 2007 re: the Board. Dr. Serban told the District accreditation subcommittee that the Board did not respond to the recommendation about reviewing policies on a regular basis. She will initiate a review process immediately. The Board should have achieved this recommendation within two years of its receipt.

**Updated timeline:**

Dec 1-Presentation of draft Planning Agendas (Actionable Improvement Plans) to

Steering Committee: Standards 1A&B; 2C

Dec 12-Second Draft due

**The next meeting of the Steering Committee: Thursday, December 1, 3:30-5 p.m.** At the Committee’s request, the meeting date *had been* changed from December 1 to December 8 to accommodate members who had to attend the District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC) on December 1. It has since been learned that the DBAC meeting has been changed from December 1 to December 8. So now the Accreditation Steering Committee has been changed back to its original meeting date on December 1, from 3:30 to 5 in the President's Conference Room.

***Actionable Improvement Plans (formerly called Planning Agendas)***

Gayle reported that what the Commission formerly called “Planning Agendas” they currently call “Actionable Improvement Plans.” Gayle said in previous years we had received criticism because some of our plans were considered “plans to plan,” but it appears now that the Commission recognizes that for some plans, a college simply cannot know the direction it will need to take at the time the plan is written. The Commission’s text describing “Actionable Improvement Plan” is:

As an institution evaluates its programs and services with reference to each Standard, it identifies areas in need of change. The Commission expects the institution to identify goals related to the areas that require change and decide on the action required to meet these goals. The institution should include the required actions in improvement plans. It may not be possible for the institution to have improvement plans fully-developed at the time of submission of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The Commission expects these actionable improvement plans to be integrated into the institution’s continuous evaluation and planning processes. Subsequently, the institution is required to report in the institutional Midterm Report how the improvement activities have been integrated into the institutional planning processes and to what extent the goals have been met.

**Future meeting dates for the rest of the year**

Thursday: December 15   3:30-5:00 (in the President’s Conference Room)