**Minutes for Accreditation Steering Committee**

**12-1-11**

1. Presentation of draft Actionable Improvement Plans (AIPs) to Steering Committee: Standards 1A & B; Standard 2C

**Standard 1**

Nancy Jones reported that Standard I met just prior to the Steering Committee meeting. They believed that just one Actionable Improvement Plan was appropriate for all four of their sub-sections. After discussion, the final AIP is:

**The PIEAC will review the effectiveness of the revised planning process and implement changes based upon the outcomes of the evaluation following the 2012-13 academic year. Systematic evaluation of the process will be conducted every other year.**

The original submission was:The PIEAC should review the effectiveness of the restructuring of the planning process and implement changes based upon the outcomes of the evaluation following the 2013-13 academic year.

Margaret suggested that the plan should go beyond 2013. Because it is a brand new planning process, it needs to have a specific evaluation process. She suggested adding a systematic evaluation or regular cycle to ensure continued planning for the college to meet its master plan process.

Gayle suggested that the new Standard I AIP be discussed by the PIEAC Committee.

Question: How do we refer to this AIP within this Standard or other Standards?

Answer: We state the complete Standard AIP such as “See Standard IAa” within the AIP section following the Evaluation section. (We want the AIPs to be cross referenced when they appear in other Standards.) If there is no AIP, then state “None.”

Question: What will be the vetting process to determine the final AIPs?

Answer: Each committee should try to determine truthful, honest goals. The plan is to then bring those to the Steering Committee so we can see the interconnectedness. Some may need to go through College Council. Some will be problem areas we need to fix now, and are not really planning goals. The list of AIPs will then go through to the PIEAC to link them through to the EMP.

Question: What happens if something changes between the end of the year and when the team comes?

Answer: We will write an addendum to the report for the team to read, with additional documentation.

**Standard 2C**

Cheryl stated that after reviewing the Accreditation surveys, she believes we need to make some changes to increase awareness of the library. She suggested these AIPs:

1. Develop a current online orientation in the use of the Coastline Virtual Library for students and faculty.
2. Develop effective outreach programs to both students and faculty regarding Library and Learning Resources services.
3. Work with the new student success faculty instructor to develop library and learning support resources that will advance the institution’s student success initiatives.
4. Continue working with Coastline and Coast District information technology personnel to develop and implement an improved login procedure for access to the Virtual Library.
5. Develop a plan and implement it in order to improve the appearance and navigation of the library web site which will ultimately improve student use, success, and satisfaction.
6. Develop a systematic evaluation program for the Coastline Virtual Library, Student Success Center, Information Commons, and other learning support services. The program will be based on identified student learning outcomes, assessment criteria, and specific institutional goals. Program will include a variety of regular data-gathering and analysis methods. Information from the evaluation program will be used specifically for program improvement, and to that end provide evidence and support for Program Review and the institutional planning and budget process.

Cheryl had a number of suggestions for how to achieve these plans, such as the need for a Webmaster to assist in redesigning to Library site, working with Michelle Ma on promotional outreach, providing information or a link to the library in the first email the student receives from the college, and including a library tutorial with the orientation to the college.

A number of specific suggestions on the AIPs were provided. Lori said that most of these AIPs were issues that the college should deal with now, and probably weren’t Actionable Institutional Plans. She said we plan to hire a Webmaster, so that individual could help Cheryl redesign her website; she also said the District recently hired someone to update their website, and that perhaps we could tap his expertise. Ann suggested that there were several areas where faculty was mentioned, and those should be addressed in the Human Resources Standard.

Margaret suggested that Cheryl review the library Planning Agendas from the last accreditation report to be sure she is not covering the same ground.

Cheryl doesn’t anticipate new staff or money for the Virtual Library, but there was an announcement at the CA Council of Chief Librarians that a panel of EBSCO host will now be available free of charge, and that will save us about $15,000 dollars a year. This will free up money to use for other library-related needs.

Cheryl shared her frustrations. She said the login based on the MyCCC username and password is OK, except when maintenance is performed at OCC, the passwords are reset, and it cuts out Seaport access and library access for 1-5 days, without advance knowledge. We need to have better District–wide cooperation.

It was reiterated that finding and sharing problems and solutions is the beauty of doing a self-study. Cheryl stated that the suggestions for improving her AIPs are valuable; she will continue to draft her document; when the first draft of the college document is composed, perhaps her finalized AIPs can be cross-referenced to other Standards and they can then be revisited.

Lori reminded the team that it is possible that AIPs that are actionable NOW may not show up in the final Self-Study report. And some may go into the document and be completed by the time the team comes. A supplement may be sent to the team that says, “Here is what has changed since the report was written.”

1. Update on progress from each Standard that has not yet turned in a draft

Ted stated that Anthony at GWC is supposed to give him a copy of their Technology plan; they have a 30 page document. Lori said that Deanza has a five-page technology plan she will share with Ted. What the Commission is looking for is a systematic process for allocating resources to technology.

Richard is not yet ready to present.

Dave is not yet ready to present.

1. Discussion of obstacles in collecting evidence and suggestions for success

Not addressed.

1. Dec 12-second drafts are due; Gayle needs this material ASAP since she will be putting the full rough draft together during the holiday break and potentially for another Substantive Change report that will be due in January.
2. Last meeting date in 2011:

**Thursday, December 15, 3:30-5:00 p.m.** (in the President’s Conference Room)

- Gayle will ask Standard 2B (Student Support Services) if they will be ready to present

- Standard 4A (Leadership and Governance) will be ready; maybe 4B

- Standard 3D (Financial Resources) will be ready to present

- We will discuss the District-submitted materials

1. Selection of January meeting date(s)

-The January meeting is: January 12, 2012, 9 a.m. to noon

(Faculty members who attend the meeting during the break will be paid for their

attendance.)