



Shasta College

ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Minutes

Thursday, February 14, 2012

Room, 2:30-3:30 PM

Meeting Call to order 2:35 PM by co-chair Sandra Hamilton Slane

Committee Members Present					
x	Marc Beam	x	Peggy Moore	x	Shelley Presnell
x	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

Guests

Joe Szydlowski- Record Searchlight Reporter

Accreditation status-*President Joe Wyse*

A brief overview was given regarding the letter from the Commission and the next steps to be taken regarding the school's probation status. The Commission is looking at past history, and because some of the same problems exist from 2008 when we were put on warning status, they want us to have a plan to fix the problem. Even though we believed we addressed the issues in 2008 and were removed from the warning status, the Commission doesn't believe that we were sustainable in some of the areas of concern. Joe said we need to roll up our sleeves and be ready in September to respond to the Commission in October. He would like College Council to form an Educational Master Plan Committee (EMP) comprised of Peggy Moore, Joe Wyse, Kevin O'Rorke, and Morris Rodrigue. The EMP is the biggest task before us. Second is the Program Review, and Academic Senate and College Council have taken the action to move forward on revisions. We will have a BETA test on the newly revised version this spring. We already have a committee working on the PLO's and SLO's. Joe stated he will charge Cabinet with the task of improving communications.

District to do list-

- Finalizing the purpose of the overall plan
- Revise integrated planning model
- Finalize the table of contents
- Form working groups
- Have a draft based on title 5 definitions
- Have a draft of what long range documents should look like
- Prepare a glossary
- Work on terms and definitions

Joe asked if there were any questions, comments or concerns. None- noted.

Joe and Sandra will be meeting next week to put together timelines and look at more detail of what the final document will look like. The workload will be divided up because there is a lot of writing to do. Joe exited at 2:50 PM.

Approval of Minutes- December 8, 2011. **Beam/Stearns**

Discussion- Peggy wanted to clarify "planning agenda updates." Sherry to get clarification on language from Sandra, or possibly removed one sentence from the minutes. Shelly corrected the spelling of her first name. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Evaluation of Self-Study process- *Sandra Hamilton Slane*

Sandra said she has received quite a bit of feedback from members and has taken out all the exact quotes. The goal is to have something that wraps up the first process. Sandra said she'd like to put closure to this document, although this document will prove useful for us in the future. **(Handout)** We should always have a goal to improve and make our documents better. This document will be used in the follow up report in October. Marc added that he thought the summary was very well done. **Motion to accept and approve the document as presented. Tello/Parisot. Discussion none, motion carried unanimously.**

Follow up report- Due to Commission October. 15, 2012

The Board meeting is October 10; the report should be ready for the Board in September. Sandra has asked Peggy to guide us through this as "the team expert". Sandra has contacted all the committee chairs and coordinators to ask that we get the minutes and agendas in real time. We no longer have the luxury of waiting on information.

The main focus will be the four (4) recommendations stated in the letter from the Commission. We need to align with the expectations from the Commission. Peggy said the Commission doesn't just look at the last report they look at the entire history, and they will be looking if we can sustain what we report.

Marc said he has observed that when a change in leadership occurs, that can cause some of the stops and starts that we have experienced on this campus, and believes the Commission wants us to be sustainable regardless of who our leadership is. We have to build processes that sustain this district. Sandra reminded all to keep this a broad process.

Peggy suggested putting together a file to do the verifications of fact and making this information accessible to all writers. Sandra said they are looking at the best method for a database. Marc said there is going to be a lot of simultaneous paralleled processes working on the EMP, SLO's, PLO's, Program Review and the report to the Commission. He added, it may be difficult for us to have the report to the Board in September. Peggy said the EMP should be pretty well finished in May. Peggy said if we start recruiting people now the pieces will come together to meet the timeline. Sandra suggested putting updates on the webpage, such as the progress we are making on the EMP. It will be available for all to see and is a great communication tool.

Marc said the Commission expects us to do all planning agendas, and we are also responsible for making sure that all planning agendas are successful. Shelly said all SLO's will be done by fall 2012. Peggy informed the group that SLO's and PLO's were adopted in 2002. Ten years is a long time to fulfill a mandate. Now the Commission is cracking down, and we have made amazing progress on this in the last couple of years.

Sandra said we must keep a good balance, and we need to look at our probation status as serious, but fixable, and respond fully. Marc said he believes the biggest challenge is we need to be able to explain to anyone what our integrated planning process is. We have to tie resources to planning, and all should know how it's done. Sandra asked if there were any other questions. None noted.

Other- None

Announcements- Next meeting dates: March 13, April 10 and May 8.

Adjournment- Parisot/Tello 3:25 PM

Next meeting – March 13, 2012

Notes taken by:
Sherry Nicholas
Student Services Division

Attachments-
Evaluation of the Accreditation Self Study process

Accreditation Steering Committee
Sandra Hamilton Slane, Co-Chair; ALO
Dr. Ramon Tello, Co-Chair

Shasta College February, 2012

Evaluation of the Accreditation Self Study process

General Overview

The Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) conducted a multi-faceted evaluation of the effectiveness of the committee and the overall accreditation self-study process. The goal of this evaluation was to compile feedback from direct participants and the college overall. Direct participants are those involved in the writing of the self study or working on the accreditation steering committee. This feedback has been reviewed and sorted by category in order to provide guidance and input for future team projects including accreditation reports. Recommendations are compiled from comments made by participants in either face-to-face debriefing meetings, emails or in online surveys. At times, individual comments may seem to contradict the overall conclusions and are included to ensure a comprehensive and inclusive perspective.

The evaluation process was composed of the following activities and timeline.

April, 2011	Final drafts of self study standards were submitted
May, 2011	Debriefing meetings (interviews) were held with each team of standard committees, the ALO and the researcher. Notes were taken.
July-Aug, 2011	Specific recommendations and feedback were solicited from editors and proof-readers
Aug-Sept 2011	Surveys for direct participants and the college at large were designed by an ad-hoc group of ASC members and research
Sept-Oct 2011 for	Conducted surveys for participants in self study (40 out of 57 responses) and members of the college-at-large (189 responses)
Oct-Nov 2011	Survey results and open comments were reviewed by Accreditation Steering Committee, with discussion on possible recommendations

Specific Themes

In reviewing the findings from the ASC surveys, the Accreditation Steering Committee identified several themes. The surveys themselves were analyzed and summarized by the Office of Research and Planning. The Accreditation Steering Committee reviewed those summaries and identified the items that revealed significant results or pointed to suggestions for the ongoing accreditation review process including future self study reports.

ASC suggests creating a publication manual for Shasta College Accreditation Reports that can provide the structure and templates to the participants in advance.

1. Format of the self study document

Summary recommendations by ASC

Provide a template for style/format, with preset font size and type for text and headings, predetermined spacing for paragraph and headings, standards for indentations and emphasis (underline, bold, italics)

Provide standard formats for titles of staff positions, committees, documents, divisions/ areas, etc. Provide standard style for presentation of data and for format of graphs, tables, and text boxes, as well as instructions for when to use these visual formats

Delineate content that belongs in various sections of the standard – Descriptive Summary, Self-Evaluation, or Planning Agenda. Also clarify the use of the ACCJC rubrics – when do they apply, and how to determine our status

2. Team member roles and responsibilities

While 75% of accreditation participants agree or strongly agree that they understood their roles and responsibilities, numerous comments and suggestions were made about recruitment, participation, and training of future participants. More than 82% of respondents in the college-wide survey agree or strongly agree that there was wide participation. Only 42% of respondents from the accreditation participants stated they had inconsistent or no training. As an overall reflection of participants' experience, 87% of respondents agreed they would definitely participate or at least consider participating in the self study process in the future.

Summary recommendations by ASC

Provide training/orientation opportunities at specific stages of the process including:

Specialized training for Standards Chairs, editors, etc.

Written descriptions of roles and expectations of participants

Improve the recruitment and participation to reach more faculty and staff

Include feedback from current surveys and evaluation to inform future participants of the responsibilities and workload of the accreditation self study process

Determine the number of participants needed in each team or role to balance the workload effectively

Outline responsibilities and suggestions for how to solicit input and provide information to constituent groups

3. Process of self-study including dissemination of information

Opinions about staff satisfaction with the overall accreditation self study process was solicited through the ASC surveys. These items focused on the timeline for the process, dissemination of information, and the self study document itself. The college wide survey shows 92% of respondents agree or strongly agree that the Accreditation Steering Committee effectively guided the process and actively participated in collegial dialogue with members of the standards committees.

Communication about the self study findings was strong, with 74% of respondents of the college-wide survey agree or strongly agree that they were informed of self-study findings, and 71% agree or strongly agree they were able to provide input. Finally, 88% of respondents on the college-wide survey agree or strongly agree the self-study is an accurate reflection of the college.

Summary recommendations by ASC

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.

Establish a website with frequent updates from the ALO or ASC co-chairs

4. Evidence

Because so much of the content to be included in the self study is derived from existing college documents, suggestions about access and storage of these documents was provided by participants. Many participants remarked on the issue of familiarity and access to evidence.

Summary recommendations by ASC

The Accreditation Steering Committee members agree that a process must be established for identifying documents to be used as evidence, storing them in a central repository, and publicizing their existence and content for broader use. Additionally, responsibility and planning for ongoing, campus-wide data collection including surveys is a priority of the Office of Research and Planning.