

**Accreditation Advisory Group
Meeting Notes
September 25, 2013
3:00-5:00 p.m.
Trophy Room**

John Freytag, Ted Wieden, Guy Grace, Christine Worsley, Sonja Nilsen, Michael Almaguer, Daniel Kiely, Florence Espiritu, Becky Opsata, Andy Kivel, Mario Tejada, Jennifer Tejada, Sue Rohlicek, Katrina Keating, Maria Barno, Ann Patton, Jeanie Dewhurst, Rachel Westlake, Cathy Walton-Woodson, Barbara Hewitt, Laurie Lema, Susan Lamb, Peter Garcia, Newin Orante, Chrisanne Knox, Rene Sporer, Tish Young, Kim Schenk, Claudia Eckelmann

1.	<p>Agenda Review (Action) There was consensus approval to accept the September 25, 2013, agenda as presented.</p>
2.	<p>Announcements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Substantive change report is in its final stages. It is about to go to Robert Burns to incorporate active links. Susan Lamb anticipates sending the report to ACCJC by the week of September 30.
3.	<p>Approval of September 11, 2013 Meeting Notes There was consensus approval to accept the September 11, 2013, meeting notes as presented.</p>
4.	<p>Reports from Co-Chairs Give an update on progress of committee. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current status of writing your Standard; • Challenges within the committee or with the writing process; • Share major findings/themes you see emerging; • Identify potential concerns in meeting the Standard. <p>Standard co-chairs and committee members reported where they are in the writing process:</p> <p><u>Standard IB:</u> They are working on their second draft, outlining what needs to be said and aligning the narrative with the Standards. They will be gathering information from the four governance committees.</p> <p><u>Standard IIA:</u> The response is well organized. They anticipate a draft by October 11. They could use additional committee members.</p> <p><u>Standard IIB:</u> The work has been divided into the four main components. They are reaching out to impacted areas for current information. <u>Standard IIC:</u> The work has also been divided into four main components. They anticipate having their draft completed by the end of October.</p> <p><u>Standard IIIA:</u> Each of the six sections of this Standard has been divided amongst members. They are using the bulleted questions to help organize the responses to the Standard. The recently submitted SLO Report is a good reference for a lot of the Standard work.</p> <p><u>Standard IIIB:</u> They have used the bulleted questions and recent follow-up reports to help address the Standard. They also found reading other recently accredited colleges' self evaluations very useful.</p> <p><u>Standard IIIC:</u> They have been focused on the evidence list to address the Standard. They are currently working on context and narrative.</p>

Standard IIID: Currently going through the evidence and working on the narrative.
Standard IV A, B: They worked on the bulleted questions and are now working on writing to the Standard. They anticipate a draft to be completed by the end of October.

Peter Garcia shared that visiting teams read the document as if it is true and then look at the evidence to see if it is. Evidence should be used to speak to the Standard. In a large piece of evidence, it is OK to use only the part that speaks to the Standard.

Committee members shared some of the challenges:

Standard IB: The committee would like to know about the latest governance actions. They are developing questions that will be addressed at each governance committee. A question was asked about a deadline for evidence gathering. Lamb shared that they should write as if the action will be accomplished, and then at the final review, non-finished work can be reworded. Mario Tejada and Andy Kivel will send their distance education document to Susan Lamb for forwarding to different Standard committees.

A recommendation was made for a central evidence storage place. A request was made to have either Susan Lamb or Peter Garcia send out a college-wide email asking folks to support the accreditation process, and if they are asked for information to please respond in a timely manner.

Standard IIA: Access to subject matter experts would be helpful.

Standard IIB: No concerns at the moment.

Standard IIC: Tutoring on campus has changed in the past seven years.

Standard IIIA: They have reviewed a large amount of information and it was difficult to know how much to include.

Standard IIIB: Ted Wieden will send the results of the 2011 ACT survey to the committee. Any operational issues they see will be reported to Susan Lamb who will follow-up.

Standard IIIC: The committee is now ready to begin writing.

Standard IIID: The committee would like to see common language in all Standards when addressing the Resource Allocation Process. Pointed out that a recommendation in the Show Cause Report is no longer part of the Standard. Lamb will research this.

Standard IV A, B: Recognize that there will be some overlap in IB and IIID. At some point the narrative in all three areas should be reviewed for a common story. The committee would like to have a student services voice.

Committee members then reviewed major findings/concerns/themes:

Standard IV A, B: A major concern is how to address the issue that there are still some voices on campus that are not happy with the present structure. Garcia shared that there will always be people who want their voices in the report. A reference is appropriate to mention that there are some strong feelings about the

	<p>issue, but the Senates are not supporting that position. We should be seen as a functioning college that is working with energy and positive direction to get the work done. The governance co-chair work should be included in the narrative. Rachel Westlake will email Peter Garcia about the exact need in clarifying the research relationship between the college and the District. This document is needed for evidence.</p> <p><u>Standard IIID:</u> Terminology challenges are holding up some sections. The language in the Standard should drive review of the evidence. Garcia shared that the Resource Allocation Process is the allocation of new funds. The RAP is not written as a single process. Garcia will create a summary of the understanding for resource allocation.</p> <p><u>Standard IIIC:</u> Evidence of the IT relationship with the District and the college should be available. Mario Tejada and Garcia will talk about the background.</p> <p><u>Standard IIIB:</u> A question was asked about a shared governance committee involved with facilities. A suggestion was made to review if that is part of the Standard.</p> <p><u>Standard IIIA:</u> No concerns at this time. The committee will set an internal timeline.</p> <p><u>Standard IIC:</u> There is a slight concern about online tutoring. They are making sure that SRC and the Basic Skills Initiative work are included.</p> <p><u>Standard IIB:</u> There are no concerns in meeting the Standard. They will need to address emerging legislation challenges and the new building logistics.</p> <p><u>Standard IIA:</u> There has been a lot of progress accomplished in curriculum, SLOs and program review. They are still reviewing distance education.</p> <p><u>Standard IB:</u> They have concerns about how to evaluate the effectiveness of the resource allocation process.</p> <p>Susan Lamb thanked everyone for their participation and hard work. She reminded them of the drop-in hours available for help. No question is too small.</p>
5.	<p>General Discussion Regarding Needs Please see responses above.</p>

Next Meeting: October 9, 2013
Trophy Room