



ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

August 24, 2016

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

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Members Present

Denise Axtell	Will Breitbach	Tim Johnston
Ron Marley	Steve Mollman	Peggy Moore
Damaris Stevens	Ramon Tello	Courtney Vigna

Members Absent

Raquel Good	Becky McCall
-------------	--------------

Guests

Jenna Highfield	Kate Mahar
-----------------	------------

DISCUSSION/ACTION:

Ramon motioned to approve the minutes from the May 19th meeting. Ron Marley seconded. Will and Peggy abstained since they were not members of the committee at the time. Motion carried unanimously.

FUTURE MEETING DATES:

Will said we need to establish meeting dates for the new academic year and also asked for input on how often we should meet since we have a busy year ahead of us. Ramon proposed that we still meet once per month but we can meet more often as necessary. Denise asked what we need to accomplish still. Ramon explained that we still need to write the self-study. The original plan was for Meridith to write the report during the summer, but since she left we had to change our plan and now the sub-groups are responsible for crafting the draft for their standards. Will stated that before we do anything else, we will need to establish meeting dates. After some discussion it was decided we would meet the 1st Wednesday of each month at 4:00 p.m.

ACCREDITATION WRITING PLAN:

Will reminded the group that last year various groups gathered data for the self-study. Will presented a handout that had major components of

the sub-committees. Will mentioned Standard 1A needs more support, and that right now it just has Cathy Anderson. Ramon volunteered to help Cathy. Ron pointed out that there are many repeating faculty on this list and we should try and reach out to others for help. Peggy added that the ACCJC team is going to want more broad-based participation and said that self-studies with broad-based participation do the best. The report should be written by the campus, not just the administrators. Will pointed out that we want someone to look at the evidence and help us make sure we are covering all of the information. Will also said that we need to find a lead editor at this point and added that it would be better to find that person sooner rather than later. The quality focus essay will focus on two areas of growth that we will have substantive action plans for. At this point we know that we have SLO's and that we can possibly focus on enrollment management since we have some growth opportunities with that.

Ramon said that for the last self-study, we went in with the mindset that we needed to come up with a list of all of our shortcomings, which turned out to be a misguided idea. He wanted to know how other schools are handling writing an action plan for each standard. Ramon also said we want the group leaders to minimize what we need to come up with instead of a laundry list of things we need to improve on. It was suggested that we need to be proactive and tell everyone a maximum of 3-5 action items per standard. Denise said maybe we can look at the action items as a committee before we write the report. Everyone agreed that our committee will look at all the action items to make sure there aren't too many. Ron mentioned we need to let everyone know that even if we are given 7 things to correct, it may get cut down to 2 or 3 and that it is important to get that message out ahead of time. Peggy said we also want to mention what we have completed from the last self-study as well. Ramon asked if we have a date and whether it should be before December. Will said yes, we will need this done before December.

Will let everyone know that we won't be able to use the Docuware database for the actual report but we will be able to use that as a bank for evidence in the narrative.

Style guidelines – The style guide is meant to put everyone on the same page. It is written according to the ACCJC style guide. We will ask that the teams use the same formatting throughout the document. Will said we also want feedback from Joe since he has been the lead on several teams. Will showed an example from Napa Valley as a model we can follow. Ron asked if we need a lead editor and a technical editor. He pointed out that

it might be easier to find someone if they know they are just responsible for one part.

Will said we need to setup a shared file. We are going to need to submit stuff in a way that we can easily access the documents. Will is going to work with IT to set up files on the I:drive.

Timeline – We need to be done by April with the final draft of the self-study. We need to send out pieces of the report for feedback as they come available. Will would like a solid draft done before the term ends. Ramon asked if we would want a draft before Thanksgiving. Tim suggested that we have the 1st draft by the end of October and then we can review it. We would like to have the second draft available for the editor by winter break. It was agreed that all of the pieces will be due by the end of October. The question came up about when the entire draft should be due to the committee. After some discussion it was decided that the 1st draft should be given to the committee by 11/2. As a committee we will give feedback by 11/16 and then the lead editor will have all of December to work on editing the 2nd draft. Peggy pointed out that we may need to be flexible with our dates.

OTHER:

Ramon brought up the Bylaws. They state that we need three faculty members and specifies Transfer/AA and Non-Instructional. Ramon asked everyone if we thought we should leave it as is or should remove the stipulations on which faculty members should be on the committee. Peggy responded that we can remove the requirement, but cautioned that we should have a mix of different types of faculty on the committee. Denise motioned that we remove the stipulations on the types of faculty (Transfer/AA and Non-Instructional) from the bylaws. Ron seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.