



ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Thursday, December 3, 2015

Board Room, 4:00-5:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Members Present

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Meridith Randall | Denise Axtell | Timothy Johnston |
| Becky McCall | Ralph Perrin | Kristen Ruano |
| Ramon Tello | Courtney Vigna | |
| Debbie Goodman | | |
| Ron Marley | | |

Members Absent

Guest

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------|------------------|
| Will Breitbach | Frank Nigro | Carolyn Singh |
| Morris Rodrigue | Mike Mari | Sharon Brisolara |

DISCUSSION/ACTION

Minutes approved from November 5th meeting.

UPDATE FROM TEAMS:

- a. Standard I – Will Breitbach, Cathy Anderson, and Sharon Brisolara are working on this standard. The Standard I team is having difficulty with Committee minutes not always reflecting the planning cycle. For example, there is not a clear action taken on items during College Council meetings. It is clear that discussions are happening on the agenda items, but there is no recorded evidence of what is done with the item once it is approved. Will also said that there is evidence of discussion and planning related to SLOs but there is no recorded evidence of that. Meridith said that the plan is to resurrect the SLO meetings in March. Hopefully this will help us present evidence of that. Meridith brought up that sometimes courses at Curriculum Committee have SLO changes, but we would still need the evidence of where the change comes from. Flex day has been used in the past for SLO discussions. Will said we seem to have decent data on ISLOs. Cathy should have the data on ISLOs and Carolyn Borg for GELOs. We knew that SLOs were a weakness and that is why we reached out to the PRT team. The other thing the

team is concerned about is how to collect evidence for the standard about disaggregating the data. Meredith said there should be evidence on the Research website about that. We seem to be okay on the data part, but not necessarily the analysis. Meredith suggested that maybe there are things we could get posted on the website now. Will asked about how to find evidence the Strategic Plan is intentionally connected to data. The new Strategic Plan should be referenced in College Council minutes and the sub-committee that created them. The next item of concern is the clear connection of budgeting to planning. Beyond the initiative process, we need evidence that the resource allocation is being data driven. Morris said we have a budget planning cycle that occurs separate from the annual planning.

On the budgeting side there is a lot of data that goes into the planning of 5 year trends. Budget committee spends time talking about things that are happening at the state level. For example, in January when the Governor's budget proposal comes out, we will revise trends again. Morris said they are also doing a new thing in budget this year where they are looking at developing fiscal health indicators that fit Shasta College. Meredith said that, for example, as far as regular budgets, the deans have to have rationale behind the budgets and we may be able to pull that stuff out.

- b. Standard II – Frank Nigro and Carolyn Singh were in attendance. Their Standard committee has had a few meetings so far and has divided the work as follows: Frank is going to work on Standard II A, Carolyn is working on Standard II B, and Kevin O'Rorke is working on Standard II C. Kevin will then loop back around to help on A. The data on the handout provided is what Standard II C has come up with so far. Frank said he will probably follow something similar on Standard II A. Carolyn is working on Standard II B right now which is Library and Learning Support Services. Frank said under Standard II A there are 16 main areas. There are areas of Standard II A that are aimed at the BA degree, so we need to work on that since we will have those for the next visit. There is flexibility in addressing things. So far the larger meetings haven't happened yet, but in early spring they are thinking they may need a sub-committee to start compiling the data. Frank said they don't have an evidence repository anywhere at this point.
- c. Standard III – Morris Rodrigue they have divided the committee as follows: Tom is responsible for the Budget aspect, Sara is overseeing the HR component, and Morris is in charge of the IT and facilities

area. Tom is working with Jill Ault to get data. Sara is going to be working with Laura Benson and Jamie Spielmann in HR and Morris is working with James Crandall and John Lutkemeier. The team is trying to get faculty members to look at everything once the data is collected so that they can vet the evidence to make sure the team is on the right track. They are planning to do the majority of the work in January. They have looked at Napa College's accreditation report, as well as a few other schools that have recently been successful in the accreditation process, to see what evidence they provided for their accreditation visits. Sara is also going to work on how we document SLOs in relation to evaluation of Faculty.

- d. Standard IV – Mike Mari and Mark Smith are the chair standards and have recruited other members of the campus community to help collect the evidence. The committee has met in person and they are using the questions ACCJC puts out as a guide. They have created folders on the shared drive and each week the team works as a group on a different substandard. There are 26 substandard's so they are going to start doing evidence collection on multiple substandards every week. Mike is sending out weekly reminders of what they are working on. Meridith asked if they have had a conversation about all the sub-standards and Mike answered they are only on Substandard 1 but some of the committee members have moved ahead. Ramon asked about the type of evidence they are gathering and Mike gave an example using innovation as a standard and using the recent email that came out about innovation funds from the president as evidence. Meridith suggested they leave enough time in their committee to address whether we meet the standard or not. Tim asked if they have found any gaps. Mike said they have not since they have just started.

FINAL REVIEW OF BYLAWS:

Moved to next meeting

NEXT MEETING:

February 4, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room