



Shasta College

ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Minutes

Thursday, December 8, 2011
Board Room, 8:00-9:00 am

Call to order 8:04 a.m. by Sandra Hamilton Slane

Committee Members Present					
x	Marc Beam	x	Peggy Moore	x	Shelly Presnell
	Kenny Brewer	x	Doug Manning	x	Sandra Hamilton Slane
x	Nancy de Halas	x	Debbie Parisot	x	Lisa Stearns
x	Debbie Goodman	x	Ralph Perrin	x	Ramon Tello

Approval of Minutes- November 10, 2011. Manning/Goodman, with three abstentions from those not present at the last meeting.

Discussion- Several edits/changes noted;

- Paragraph #2 –Add “for the purpose of improving communication campus-wide.”
- Paragraph #3 –Debriefing; change to “all full time faculty”.
- Paragraph #4 – Summary Reports; add “observations of the ASC”, and on the 9th bullet add the word “intrinsic”.
- Paragraph #7 -Agenda items remaining; change wording to “Marc and Sandra compiling a working glossary”.

Update-self study process

Sandra shared that the District has received the accreditation team’s evaluation report. Cabinet, Sandra and Marc are reviewing for any “errors of fact”. Once this has been done it will be sent back to the team chair for review again, and then it will be sent on to the Commission. Sandra said it’s best not to second guess what the report will say, and from what she has read, the statements from the team were not negative, but truthful and what was expected. The Commission meets January 10th-12th, and then we can expect a letter telling us our status with the revisions and recommendations by the end of January 2012.

Peggy added that we are building from the ground up; starting with the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and all documents should be working together. The EMP is under way, and Marc is running the focus groups. The themes will be teased out and then put out to the campus community. Marc noted that the focus groups are beginning to develop partnerships, and the hope is to have the EMP done by May 2012.

Summary- evaluation of self-study process – Handout

Part of the intent of this process is to serve as a model from other campuses. This is the feedback on what we did well and what we can do better in the future. This document has not been shared outside of this committee yet. Marc has gone through the document and made some wordsmith changes for more clarification. All his edits were minor and did not change the content. Some editing still needs to be done so that this document will demonstrate to any reader a clear understanding of its content. Sandra added that the bullets are actual quotations from groups or surveys. They are compiled into categories and themes.

Areas of concern noted:

- Number 2- "Broad participation"- there are comments shown but it doesn't give evidence to back up the comments, could be interpreted as contradictory. Marc explained that is it okay to show contradiction, but we must be clear about what our recommendation is.
- Not all survey questions were answered by all participants.
- Present information in a way that is truthful and understandable. Example: 82% is a big number, but if only 5 responded, it can be misleading.
- The percentages only reflect who actually responded.
- Add percentage of responses to the questions and not to the entire survey.

Planning Agenda updates

It's time to articulate the planning agendas, timelines, items with deadlines, and who is responsible in each area, starting with the goals first.

Peggy gave a brief update on Program Review- The committee has come up with a two-prong approach because the word "program" is used in a variety of ways. The decision was made to define program review as a series of courses leading to a degree or certificate. Courses in math, English, history and philosophy are not programs so we need to get away from our previous definitions. All areas would do an area plan that states goals and what changes might need to be made, and will tie to budget, facilities, etc. At this point, a draft of this new approach will go to the Senate. The goal is to use this document as the "New Program Review", and it will be in line with Title 5, and measurable.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's) will need to be developed, they will be threaded together to make the connection, and there will be area plans that tie into the Educational Master Plan. This will be a plan where people can understand and value the process. This plan needs to be based on data and looking at achievement outcomes.

Other items- Options for improving institutional dialogue include posting agendas before meetings, having minutes that are reader friendly, precise and understandable. All chairs of committees need to be on board with the note taking process. It is vital to make sure that all chairs and committee members understand their roles and responsibilities about sharing information with their respective constituents.

Sandra has met with the library staff to look at a process for archiving and referencing all evidence collection in the future, such as setting up a central place like a library catalog with many different headings and cross references.

Spring Meeting Schedule

It has been determined that there is one hour a month when all committee members can meet. The second Tuesday of each month at 2:30 p.m. Meeting dates are on today's agenda. Each spring this committee should pick a time for the follow year.

We have one action item from today's meeting.

We need to make minor edits/revisions to the evaluation document and send it to College Council.

Adjournment- 8:57 a.m.

Notes recorded by:

Sherry Nicholas

Student Services Division

Attachment: Evaluation of the Accreditation Self Study process

Accreditation Steering Committee

November, 2011

Sandra Hamilton Slane, Co-Chair; ALO

Dr. Ramon Tello, Co-Chair

Evaluation of the Accreditation Self Study process

General Overview

The Accreditation Steering Committee conducted in a multi-faceted evaluation of the effectiveness of the committee and the overall accreditation self-study process.

The following activities and timeline represent the components of the evaluation process.

April, 2011	Final drafts of self study standards were submitted
May, 2011	Debriefing meetings were held – separate meetings with members of each standard committee
July-Aug, 2011	Specific recommendations and feedback from content editors and from format editor
Aug-Sept 2011	Survey tools for participants in self study and for college at large were designed by Accreditation Steering Committee members
Sept-Oct 2011	Survey tools for participants in self study and for college-at-large were conducted
Oct-Nov 2011	Review of feedback with additional observations from Accreditation Steering Committee

Specific Themes

Comments and recommendations revolved around several themes.

1. Format/mechanics

- Provide a template for style/format
 - Font size and type – text and headings
 - Spacing – paragraph and headings
 - Indentations
 - Emphasis – underline, bold, italics
- Titles
 - Staff positions
 - Committees
 - Documents
 - Divisions, areas
- Style
 - Graphs
 - Tables
 - Text boxes
- The document page setup should be the same for each standard. I would suggest providing a pre-formatted template next time, with specifics provided as to font size, etc.
- Conformity should be used for document names. For example, Board Policies were shown in a variety of ways (BP 2700, Board Policy 2700, Board Policy 2700: correct—and sometimes incorrect-board policy name, etc...).
- It would be helpful to have one preferred writing style and format for presenting data
- At times it was confusing what information belonged under the Descriptive Summary or the Evaluation. I sometimes thought there should be a planning agenda when others did not, so it was unclear to me when there should be a planning agenda as it didn't seem consistent.

2. Team member roles and responsibilities

75% of accreditation participants agree or strongly agree that participants understood their roles and responsibilities

Recruitment

- Provide resources including training for all participants
- I was not part or asked to be part of the accreditation process

- Increase recruitment of participants – too few on standards teams

Broad participation - More than 82% of respondents in the college-wide survey agree or strongly agree that there was wide participation.

- I could have used better guidance on how to provide opportunities for input from faculty and staff
- I understand that adjuncts would be more willing to participate if they were offered a stipend. I believe having more adjuncts would be very beneficial.
- There is a great need for expanded faculty input. Large departments on campus should have automatic representation on committees
- Talk to staff in the area, all staff, not managers only!

Training/expectations - 42% of respondents from the accreditation participants stated they had inconsistent or no training.

- Provide more support for initial stages
- Establish balance between doing it yourself vs. asking busy people to participate
- Provide stronger understanding of the roles of Standards chairs, including the recruitment of participants.
- Meeting with chairs/co-chairs of teams was valuable.
- Insure continuity of Standards team members
- Define role of editors and insure the document is edited at several levels rather than rely on just a few people to edit the entire document.
- Define the role of all participants – position descriptions
- I was unaware there was training (3).
- Guidance didn't come until the spring. There was a lot of confusion and a feeling of "I don't know what I am doing" for many of the writers.
- Expectations of each participant should be clearly, accurately, and honestly stated
- I know this was voluntary, and I don't really know the expectation of time involved, but this took a whole lot of time and most of it after work hours

3. Process of self-study including dissemination of information

92% of respondents in college-wide survey agree or strongly agree that the Accreditation Steering Committee effectively guided the process.

Timeline

- Timeline of training in Fall 2009 was too early. There was too long a gap between training and recruitment of participants.
- Dissemination of survey material was too late
- Timeline: Establish a very specific timeline for completion of each of the standards, working backward from the due date. A reasonable amount of proofreading, formatting and printing time should be accounted for.

Dissemination of information about accreditation –

74% of respondents of college-wide survey agree or strongly agree that they were informed of self-study findings.

71% of respondents of college-wide survey agree or strongly agree they were able to provide input. 92% of accreditation participants agree or strongly agree committee members (including those on standards committees) actively participated in collegial dialogue.

- Provide updates in the form of succinct statements about progress in accreditation activities to broad campus community.
- I was unaware of what I could report to my constituents; It was not made clear whether the information from my sub-committee was shared across campus.
- I believe we could do a better job of getting information out to the whole campus
- Strongest part of our model is the input from different constituent groups rather than having high-level management craft a document
- I was not informed of self-study findings via my constituent group
- For those of us not involved in the accreditation process, college-wide email updates would be helpful to keep us informed
- Communication, communication, communication. Shasta has lacked in this area for years. All must be in the loop of information in order to contribute and feel as though their opinion counts.

Self-study - 88% of respondents on the college-wide survey agree or strongly agree the self-study is and accurate reflection of the college.

- Clarify the use of the rubrics – when do they apply, how do we determine our status

- For topics that span standards, such as planning, institutional effectiveness, SLOs, use centralized staff who have expertise in these areas
- Edits: Ideally, the document would be in final form (including all evidence citations) when it arrives on the proofreader's desk.
- When I've been involved in self studies at other institutions, there have been interviews and surveys that inform what goes into the reports on each standard. I didn't see either of those processes here this time. The same few faculty and staff and the same administrators generally produce these documents and serve on key committees.
- I believe the process could be even more transparent and allow for input of a greater number of people as we establish a rubric for the writing

4. Evidence

- Keep a database of information that is continuously updated
- Use common repository for evidence and data (2)
- Centralize storage of documents that are more proprietary
- Insure more frequent distribution of surveys
- Provide process that makes finding the evidence to substantiate statements easier
- Establish style for reference links both within the document and where evidence can be found.
- Evidence Citing: Authors/Editors should be specific when citing their evidence. There were many instances of very general notes, such as "check several years' minutes." Given the amount of links and evidence, it really slows down the evidence collector if time is spent tracking down whatever exact document the author intended to cite
- The actual title of the document cited should be used. In many cases, the common usage name was written, rather than the exact name
- All evidence should be provided in .pdf format, not Word, excel or .html.
- Determine where the evidence links should point to and how it will be linked and provide with the style template
- Surveys should be completed and assessed prior to the writing of any standards