**Minutes of Accreditation Steering Committee**

**3-1-12**

**Members Present:** Lori Adrian, Darian Aistrich, Gayle Berggren, Ted Boehler, Maribeth Daniel, Dan Jones, Nancy Jones, Margaret Lovig, Bob Nash, Christine Nguyen, Vince Rodriguez, Wendy Sacket, Cheryl Stewart

**Members Absent:** Dave Cant, Ann Holliday, Tarez Henderson, Bill Kerwin, Richard Kudlik, Rick Lockwood, Vinicio Lopez, Laurie Melby, Jorge Sanchez, Lois Wilkerson

1. Current Actionable Improvement Plans for Discussion

Actionable Improvement Plans for Standard II B-Student Services and Standard II A & B-China were discussed.

It was suggested to reword II.B.3.a. from “Coastline will develop strategies to increase student awareness and the importance of utilizing of student support services so as to promote enhanced student success” to “Coastline will implement strategies to raise to raise student awareness of student support services.”

It was suggested to reword EBUS II.A.8 “Complete program review in spring 2012 and develop a mechanism to assist in guiding program planning and overall improvement as a whole” to “Complete program review in 2012 and develop a mechanism to assist in guiding program planning and overall improvement as a whole.”

It was suggested to reword EBUS II.A.6.c.“Establish a clear contract with XJHS that says all and any publicity must be approved by the Coastline EBUS staff before it is allowed to be published” to “Establish communication with XJHS clarifying that all and any publicity must be approved by the Coastline EBUS staff before it is allowed to be published.” [Ask Laurie Melby if it is in the contract; we don’t need to say we will put it in the contract if it already is there.]

2. Discussion of Accreditation Timeline

A draft copy of the self-study is being prepared to go to the Board by March 9. The same text prepared for the Board copy will be placed on the college Dashboard for review by the college constituencies on March 9.

It was decided that the finalized AIPs are too difficult to review and understand out of context (without the description and evaluation section sections) so we will not present them to the PIeAC.

Gayle still has a deadline of trying to get a nearly final draft ready by May 23 so the faculty can participate in review prior to leaving for the summer.

3. Areas of Report Not Yet Complete

The status of the overall document was discussed. Drafts still needing to be turned in or updates to needed to drafts were discussed and commitments were obtained. Drafts for Standard 1 and Standard 2C will be turned in by Friday, March 2.

4. Need for Technical Proofing

There is a need for input from the college community to get agreement with what has been written, but also proofing from a wide audience for accuracy. Marilyn Fry will be proofing for grammar, spelling, and style, so that type of editing is not needed.

One suggestion is if the document is placed on the college Dashboard in one document format, directions could be mailed to the college community to search the document by keyword for areas related to their own programs or areas of interest.

It was suggested that College Council members and PIEAC members should all read the entire report; it was also suggested that Academic Senate members should read the entire report.

It was suggested that the Accreditation Steering Committee members could read sections of the report.

It was suggested that Standing Committees with expertise could read the following specific sections:

Program Review: **Standard 2A** Instructional Programs

Technology committee: **Standard 3C-**Technological Resources

Classified Executive Board: **Standard 4A-**Decision Making

Classified/Tran Ha **Standard 3D-**Financial Resources

Facilities Committee- **Standard 3B-**Physical Resources

Budget Committee- **Standard 3D-**Financial Resources

**Front materials-** Michelle Ma

**Standard 1A** Mission-Margaret

**Standard 1B** Effectiveness-Jorge and Margaret

**Standard 2A** Instructional Programs **-**Vince

**Standard 2B-** Student Svs.-**Done** (by Lois)

**China—**Joycelyn

**Standard 2C-**Library/Learning Resources-D. Johnson, R. Lockwood, B. Nash, D. Brown

**Standard 3A-**Human Resources-Margaret Lovig

**Standard 3B-**Physical Resources-Facility Committee

**Standard 3C-**Technological Resources-Technology Committee

**Standard 3D-**Financial Resources-Budget

**Standard 4A-**Decision Making-Senate, Classified, College Council

**Standard 4A**–Board-Senate, Classified, College Council

Suggested rubric for use by those reviewers:

Identify:

Factual errors, missing data, conflicting descriptions, conflicting language, verboseness, lack of clarity, statements that are not supported by evidence (opinion).

Recommendations need to be connected to the evaluation.

It was suggested that we need to collect comments, but at this point we will only be looking for content inaccuracies in order to make the manuscript factually correct (Marilyn Fry will make the grammatical corrections, so not everyone needs to proof for “final style editing). Track Changes is difficult for many people. Nancy suggested that readers could submit a page of notes indicating page numbers and a summary of changes (this might include inaccuracies, tone, overall impression, how did it read, whether it was accurate or complete), or suggested changes at the top or bottom of each page. Or, highlighting and strikethrough can be used. In this way, Gayle can see what changes are being suggested.

It was asked if copies could be made to circulate, as opposed to reading the text online; Graphics reported that 150 pages copied double sided would cost $16.50 per copy. We can do this when we are closer to the final draft.

It was suggested that the “Accrediting visitor template” could also be used as a review tool.

5. Date of Next Steering Committee Meeting

March 15, 9-11 a.m., in the Fourth Floor Conference Room.