Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Approved Minutes
August 31, 2010
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Kate Pluta, Joyce C. Ester, Hamid Eydgahi, Ann Morgan, Klint Rigby, Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bonnie Suderman, Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Kimberly Van Horne, Miranda Whipple

Absentees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Loy Saldarda, Rachel Vickrey

The purpose of the meeting today is to determine "where we start" and "where we want to be" with the collection of information and evidence for each Recommendation and Future Planning item listed in the Mid-Term Report.

1. Rubrics - The Mid-Term Report under Rubrics (pg. 3) is titled, "Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review". This matrix is a sample of how we need to reach the highest level of "sustainable continuous quality improvement" status.

Planning (pg. 27) Standard IV: Leadership and Governance is a sample of a standard that is partially done (where "sustainable continuous quality improvement" status) needs to be met by gathering information and evidence.

An organizational chart was discussed at the last KCCD Administrators Retreat that lists descriptive information regarding BC campus functions.

Action: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg will check if one is completed and available for distribution from the KCCD website.

2. Mid-Term Report/Quarterly Report/October Meeting – A quarterly report is given by Greg Chamberlain regarding campus accreditation updates to the Board of Trustees. The status report is given in a 5 minute presentation that includes information from each KCCD campus. The deadline for the next quarterly report to the District is September 27 for the October Board Meeting.

The screening committee discussed ideas on what may be included in the summary report that Greg Chamberlain will present. The suggestions are: the name of the committee responsible for the evidence, the name of the contact regarding submission of the evidence, and copies of back up information (agendas, minutes, and reports).

Handouts: Kate distributed a sample of the San Diego City College Self-Study Timeline. The handout will be helpful when reviewing the Future Plans component of the Mid-Term Report in developing a condensed format.

3. Determine Next Steps - The Accreditation Steering Committee decided to delegate each Recommendation to a key point person. That person will gather evidence and write a paragraph reporting the status of the Recommendation assigned to them. The reporting person will have a checklist of questions to answer, to include: "not started", "in progress", "completed", and "what is the next step?" That person will also be asked to attach the evidence or indicate what they are doing to obtain the evidence for each Recommendation. **Action:** Committee members that receive an email to collect evidence and write a status summary will submit the information to the Accreditation Steering Committee by September 10, 2010.

Action: Kate Pluta will submit a template that includes the Recommendation questions to the individuals listed below.

Recommendation 1: Unit Planning and Program Review – Ann Morgan and Diana Kelly

Recommendation 2: Student Learning Outcomes – Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Bernadette Towns, Diana Kelly, Ann Morgan, Bonnie Suderman, and Joyce Ester

Recommendation 3: District Planning – Greg Chamberlain

Recommendation 4: BC Strategic Planning – Greg Chamberlain, Corny Rodriguez, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Ann Morgan, and Diana Kelly

Recommendation 5: Library/Counseling – Bonnie Suderman and Joyce Ester

Recommendation 6: Staffing Needs – Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Abe Ali, Ron Kean, and Corny Rodriguez

Recommendation 7: Professional Development –Corny Rodriguez, and Greg Chamberlain

Recommendation 8: Adjunct Faculty Evaluations – Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg and Joyce Ester

Recommendation 9: Code of Ethics – Greg Chamberlain

Recommendation 10: Facilities – LaMont Schiers

Recommendation 11: Budget Allocation Model – Greg Chamberlain

Recommendation 12: College Council – Greg Chamberlain

Recommendation 13: Board of Trustees – Greg Chamberlain

Recommendation 14: Decision Making Map – Greg Chamberlain

Next Meeting: Review San Diego timeline; discuss recommendations (to Greg) for participation in the next Self-Study training. The training is scheduled for September 20 from 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m., location TBD.

Accreditation Steering Committee
Tuesday, September 14, 2010
Collins Conference Center
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Approved Minutes

Attendees: Joyce Ester, Hamid Eydgahi, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Sue Granger-Dickson, Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Klint Rigby, Kirk Russell, Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey, Miranda Whipple

Absent: Loy Salarda, Lamont Schiers, Bonnie Suderman, Vickie Turney
Kimberly Van Horne

Recorder: Angela Craft on behalf of Vickie Turney

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m.

Approval of August 31st Minutes:

- Members approved minutes with corrections to one typing error. Changing Screening Committee to Steering Committee, in the bottom second paragraph.

Action: Nan mentioned that she'd take action to bring copies of the org chart to the next meeting.

Update: A copy of the org chart has been placed in public folders.

Review Responses to Recommendations – Kate Pluta

- Kate reported that she got responses back on Recommendations 1, 2, 4F, 4G, 5A, 6, and 8. She also reported that Greg Chamberlain is working on anything that has to do with District Recommendations, and is also working with Sandra Serrano, and Tom Burke. Nothing was received on Recommendations 3, 7, 9, and 10. Recommendations 11, 12, 13, 14 are the District's. Committee members discussed organizing the report, and shared their ideas on how others could have access.

Action: Kate will take action to send something out to get things started, so that everyone can provide feedback.

Update: Completed

What the Process has revealed – Kate Pluta

- Kate discussed a handout of San Diego's Self Study with the committee members. The goal of the Steering Committee would be to set up a Self-Study Committee in fall 2010. Nan shared that co-chairs are needed for the sub-sections and the steps that must be taken. Spring 2011 would be when the self-study committee could be researching and reporting to the Steering Committee.

Members shared information and gave references on how to set up the Self-Study. San Diego's template was sent out for review.

Determined Next Steps – Kate Pluta

- Rubric planning was discussed.

Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 21, 2010 at 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Accreditation Steering Committee
Tuesday, September 21, 2010
Collins Conference Center
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Approved Minutes

Attendees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Sue Granger-Dickson, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, Lamont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey, Miranda Whipple

Absent: Joyce Ester, Hamid Eydgahi, Ann Morgan, Klint Rigby, Loy Salarda, Bonnie Suderman, Vickie Turney, Kimberly Van Horne

Recorder: Angela Craft on behalf of Vickie Turney

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

Approval of September 14th Minutes:

- Minutes were not approved. Adjustments and corrections were made.

District Organization Chart Packet -

- Nan gave a hardcopy of the District's Org Chart to Kate. The committee would like an electronic copy of the chart.

Action: Nan will ask Vickie to place a copy in public folders under Accreditation.

Update: A copy of the org chart has been placed in the public folders under Accreditation Steering Committee

- Attendees discussed the ACCJC training.

Action: Kate will send an electronic copy of the standards exercise used in training.

Update: Completed

Quarterly Report for BOT - Handout

- Nan explained the report, and what the Board is requesting from the committee. Members read and discussed the Rubric throughout the meeting.

Action: Nan will write the report.

Update: Quarterly Report has been written and is posted in the public folders.

Next Focus - Kate

Action: To get the Self-Evaluation Team up and running. For the next meeting, members were asked to think of ways to get this done.

Update: Completed

Action: Kate will do a flow chart of the planning process (from ACCJC training).

Update: Completed

The next committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 5 at 3:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Approved Minutes
October 5, 2010
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Kate Pluta, Joyce C. Ester, Hamid Eydgahi, Sue Granger-Dickson, Klint Rigby, Kirk Russell, Bonnie Suderman, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey, and Miranda Whipple

Absentees: Ann Morgan, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, and Kimberly Van Horne

Guest: Diana Kelly

Review of Minutes of September 21, 2010 meeting:
Action: Vickie Turney to make correction to Miranda Whipple's name.
Update: Miranda's name has been corrected.

1. Self Evaluation Committee Discussion - The committee discussed the need for a faculty co-chair (.400 reassigned time) and faculty editor (.200 reassigned time) to be assigned on an ongoing basis. The positions would be for the spring 2011 through spring 2013. Thereafter, the positions would be reevaluated.

The Self Evaluation Committee list includes: 11 subsets of faculty and administrative members, with 2 co-chairs each. Each subset would submit semester reports of their progress. The committee reviewed the glossary committee list and suggested changes to the subcommittees.

Action: Kate Pluta to revise list and send to the committee.
Update: Sent Tuesday, October 5, following meeting.

IIA – Curriculum, Enrollment, Assessment
IA- Mission, College Council
IB - IEC, Assessment
All of II (A, B, C) - add FCDC
IIB - Student Support Services, Matriculation Committee, Financial Aid
IIC – add Library Staff, LRIT Directors Meeting,
IIIA – add Equivalency Committee
IIID – Physical Resources include – Facilities Planning Sub-Committee, and Safety
IIIC – Technology include – ISIT
IIID - Financial Resources include – Budget Committee, and Budget Allocation Model (BAM)
IVA and IVB include - Academic Senate
IVA – Leadership include – College Council, Admin Council, and Presidents Cabinet and SGA

Add SGA to IIA, IIB, IIC

The committee reviewed changes to the committee charge as follows:

Action: Kate Pluta to revise list and send to committee.
Update: The committee has received revision.

1. Participate – Training
2. Research – review and respond to previous recommendation/planning agendas, identify evidence, use sub-committees to coordinate campuswide constituents with their own focus groups.
3. Identify documents-evidence- make recommendations
4. Document Findings
5. Use template to write evaluation
6. Semester reports

The ASC also recommended that .200 reassigned time be allocated to the faculty co-chair of the ASC.

College Goals – College Council goals under number 7 Linkages ASC committee recommendation for change:

Inform campus community about the decision making process as outlined in the DMD. Continue the dialog and use college wide feedback to improve the process.

2. ASC Membership

Action: Vickie to revise list_serve
Update: LaMont Schiers and Dianna Kelly have been added to the list. Sue Granger-Dickson email address has been corrected in the list_serve.

LaMont Schiers will be added to the committee list. A motion was passed to add co-chair of IEC/Program Review, Diana Kelly to ASC committee. Kimberly Van Horne, current committee member, has resigned. Joyce Ester will be added to the committee list.

Action: Kate Pluta to inform Academic Senate that another Basic Skills representative will be needed for the ASC committee.

Update: Completed

Accreditation Steering Committee
Unapproved Minutes
October 26, 2010
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair) Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Klint Rigby, Kirk Russell, Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey, Miranda Whipple,

Absentee: Hamid Eydgahi, LaMont Schiers, and Bonnie Suderman

Guest: Diana Kelly

1. Review of minutes

The minutes of September 14, September 21, and October 5 are reviewed and approved with minor corrections.

2. Training

Two training sessions are planned:
- November 19 at the next FCDC meeting at 10:30 a.m. in the Collins Conference Center.
- November 23 during the regularly scheduled ASC meeting at 3:30 p.m. in the Collins Conference Center. The Curriculum, Assessment, and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) will be invited to this session.

All committees will receive an invitation with the choice of attending one of the scheduled training sessions.

Action: The Executive Vice President's office is to send out an invitation for accreditation training.

Update: Completed

The committee discussed candidates that would be beneficial to the ASC committee to fill the basic skills opening.

Action: Kate Pluta will speak with Joyce Kirst, Susan McQuerrey, Regina Hukill, and Patrice Plummer regarding committee participation.

Update: Completed

3. SEC Charge

The discussion proposed changes to SEC Charge (Draft 1) that includes reassigned time for both faculty co-chair and editor. Also, changes to the timeline (Draft 3) were indicated to match items listed on the Charge. The proposal is to change Spring 2011 SEC Charge faculty co-chair from .200 reassigned time to .400. and transferring faculty

editor (.2 reassigned time for one semester or $4,000 stipend) information to SEC Charge (Draft 1).

The Self Evaluation Committee consists of administrators and faculty. The committee decided to include SGA and classified members on the SEC Charge draft.

Action: Kate Pluta is to revise the SEC Charge (Draft 1) to reflect changes discussed by the committee.

Update: Completed

Action: The committee is to develop a job description for the Chair for the SEC Charge.

Update: Completed

Action: Kate Pluta, Sue Granger-Dickson, and Rachel Vickrey will draft a job description for the co-chair of SEC Charge.

Update: Completed

3. ASC Timeline and ACCJC participation

Action: Kate Pluta is to make changes on Draft timeline 3

Update: Completed

Action: The committee is encouraged to participate on a site visit. Many from different disciplines are needed. Kate Pluta announced that committee members are to email her regarding participation.

Update: Will be added to a future meeting agenda.

The committee members that indicated an interest are Ann Morgan, Rene Trujillo, Joyce Ester, Diana Kelly, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Kirk Russell, and Klint Rigby.

Accreditation Steering Committee
Unapproved Minutes
November 2, 2010
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Sue Granger-Dickson, Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Klint Rigby, Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bonnie Suderman, Rachel Vickrey, Miranda Whipple

Absentees: Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo

Guest: Diana Kelly

1. **Review and approve minutes**

The minutes for October 26 were reviewed and approved.

2. **Finalize and approve SEC faculty co-chair job description**

The committee discussed changes to the job description and a consensus was reached to make modifications.

Action: Kate Pluta will change the last bullet point from "draft" to "report". The paragraph written at the bottom of the page is to be deleted.

Update: Kate made the necessary changes and sent to the ASC committee for review.

Action: Kate Pluta will mention the revised SEC faculty co-chair job description to the Academic Senate this week. They will receive a final copy after approval has been made by the BC President.

Update: The Academic Senate sent out an announcement for interested parties to apply for the SEC faculty co-chair position with a deadline of Friday, November 19 at 12 noon.

2. **Update from Nan regarding Barbara Beno workshop**

Barbara Beno, Susan Clifford, and other representatives responsible for accreditation research met with various chief instructional officers at a recent workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to convey a continued communication between colleges and ACCJC. The representatives also encouraged campuses to participate in the accreditation process. Another part of the discussion was the guideline that campuses should be focused on with their own accreditation process, which included linking, planning, and budget.

3. **Review our charge to see if we are on track – ASC Charge**
The review focused on recruiting people to participate in the accreditation process.

4. **Suggestion to include the time of commitment of the SEC charge: 1 to ½ year**
   a. Under each sub-standard a description of what is involved in the committee.
   b. Classified members – what is a good way to get students and classified staff involved? A suggestion to interviewing classified personnel from different areas to get their thoughts on a sub-standard is a good start. What is the classified role in SEC?

Action: Kate Pluta will speak with Jennifer Marden regarding classified support roles.

Update: Jennifer Marden will speak with committees after reviewing the list of standards given to her to explain that the ASC committee is asking for participation.

Action: Kate Pluta will send out a description for each sub-standard to the committee.

Update: Kate sent out the description for each sub-standard to the committee.

   c. ASC would be the group to organize focus groups

What do we need to work on as a whole committee?

- DMTF – Linking decisions and budget should be addressed
- Responses to recommendations and planning agendas status - add to next meeting agenda

Action: Committee is assigned to review planning agendas in the mid-term report by the next ASC meeting. Also, the committee is to bring a copy of the Accreditation Mid-Term 2009 report to the next meeting.

Update: The committee talked about the planning agendas briefly and will be discussed in greater detail in future meetings.

Action: Kate Pluta will send out the planning agendas from San Diego to review.

Update: Kate sent out the planning agenda sample from San Diego.

Action: Proposal for committee to review (program reviews and unit plans) to get feedback for IEC committee. Add to the agenda in the near future.

Update: This item will be considered in the future.

Action: Ann Morgan to send instructional program review and unit plan template forms to the committee. Send ISIT plan along with templates.

Update: Ann Morgan sent program review and unit plan template and forms out to the committee.

5. **Next Meeting**
In two weeks:
1. Discuss Planning Agendas from the Accreditation Mid-Term 2009

Accreditation Steering Committee
Unapproved Minutes
November 16, 2010
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, Sue Granger-Dickson, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Kate Pluta (co-chair), LaMont Schiers, Berndette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey, Miranda Whipple

Absent: Ann Morgan, Klint Rigby, Kirk Russell, and Bonnie Suderman

Guest: Diana Kelly

1. The November 2, 2010 minutes were reviewed and approved with minor changes.

2. Planning agendas and standards from mid-term report

A brief discussion took place regarding the idea of developing small working sub-groups for the planning agendas and standards.
The committee discussed the four-page document Kate sent. It has four different ACCJC approaches to working on and reviewing the standards. Suggestions were made to include an explanation at the top of each page explaining its purpose.

Action: Kate Pluta to provide an introduction to the four-page document that includes a 'how to' explanation.

Update: The document was completed and the committee was in agreement to use.

3. These Items were considered a list of priorities for the ASC Committee to think about moving forward:

- How to communicate with standing committees
- Develop a calendar and timeline for SEC co-chair (committee) and ASC
- Philosophy – How we value accreditation
- ASC Website
- Central location for reporting and evidence
- Timeline for flex week (?)

Action: Bernadette Towns will develop a form for reporting (accreditation, assessment, and program review) purposes suitable for the campus community to consider at the end of each semester. Bernadette will have the form available for review by the next ASC meeting.

Update: The form was completed and will be placed on the December 7 meeting for further discussion.

Action: LaMont Schiers will develop a self evaluation calendar and send out to the committee for review.

Update: The timeline/calendar was completed. LaMont Schiers will email revisions discussed in the November 23 meeting to Kate Pluta.

Action: Miranda Whipple will draft an email for a 'call out' for the SEC co-chair position and send a copy to Nan and Kate for review.

Update: The 'call out' for the SEC co-chair position was sent out for interested parties to apply.

Action: Sue Granger-Dickson, Rene Trujillo, and Rachel Vickery will write a draft Philosophy statement by the next ASC meeting

Update: The philosophy statement was completed and reviewed. Minor suggestions were made for further discussion at the December 7 meeting.

4. FCDC Accreditation Training – November 19

Nan and Kate will present information to Faculty Chairs/Directors Council (FCDC) on November 19 regarding accreditation. The committee agreed Nan and Kate should include the following talking points: Glossary of Terms, timeline, SEC Charge, and SEC co-chair position.

5. Next meeting:

   1. Review minutes – November 16
   2. Recap FCDC training for next meeting on November 23.
   3. Self evaluation calendar
   4. Form
   5. Philosophy statement

6. Announcements: Joyce Ester asked committee members to complete the staff development survey.

Accreditation Steering Committee
Approved Minutes
November 23, 2010
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Joyce Ester, Sue Granger-Dickson,
Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Kate Pluta (co-chair), Klint Rigby, Kirk
Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Miranda Whipple

Absentees: Hamid Eydgahi, Diana Kelly, Ann Morgan, Bonnie Suderman, Renee
Trujillo, and Rachel Vickrey

1. Review and approve November 16, 2010 minutes – approved with minor
changes.

2. Review formal and informal course assessment report form. A number of
suggestions were made regarding the form that included:

a. Password protection for the assessment report form on the accreditation
website.
b. Send the assessment report form to faculty through survey monkey form.
c. Present the assessment report form to the FCDC committee.

**Action: Bernadette Towns will revise form based on today's discussion and
send revision out before the next meeting.**

3. Accreditation timeline/calendar – LaMont Schiers

The calendar was reviewed by the committee resulting in an agreement of a
few changes to the content.

**Action: LaMont Schiers will email the accreditation timeline revisions
discussed in the meeting to Kate Pluta for review.**

4. ASC Philosophy Statement – Sue Granger-Dickson

Sue handed out a draft copy and read the statement in its entirety to the
committee. The committee suggested minor changes that included shortening
the statement.

**Action: Sue Granger-Dickson will revise the philosophy statement and send
it to the committee for review and further discussion.**

5. SEC cover sheet/guideline

The committee had reviewed the SEC coversheet and guideline handout sent by Kate Pluta in a previous email. Everyone was in agreement to use this version of the packet.

6. Faculty Chair/Directors Council (FCDC)
Kate Pluta and Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg debriefed the ASC committee regarding the FCDC accreditation training that took place on November 19, 2010.

Action: Send out a survey monkey link to College Council and FCDC for feedback regarding the accreditation training.

Action: Add accreditation to the FCDC agenda for further discussion regarding ASC committee recruitment, how accreditation fits into daily activities, types of changes made by a department during the semester, and focus groups.

Action: The ASC committee is asked to bring names (faculty, students, staff, and administration) to the December 7 meeting for each 11 standards that include both co-chars (1 faculty member and 1 administrator) best suited to participate in these sub-committees.

Accreditation Steering Committee
Unapproved Minutes
December 7, 2010
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Joyce Ester, Hamid Eydgahi, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, and Rachel Vickrey.

Absentees: Diana Kelly, Bonnie Suderman, and Renee Trujillo.

1. Review and approve November 23, 2010 minutes – approved with minor changes.

Minutes of November 23, 2010 were reviewed and approved with the following corrections:
  - "discussed possibility of …..password protected…."

  - #5 Kate provided ASC coversheet, compressed standards to the budget committee for the binder

ASC Timeline corrections noted below
  - <u>outcome</u>   16 college <u>community</u>
  - remove vision and intention, leave philosophy
  - remove word 'global'
  - #7 is not just January

Action: Kate will correct the Timeline and send to LaMont.

Informal and Formal – Improving Instruction Survey

Discussion about the purpose of the survey, how the information will be used and the method of distribution.
  - Survey will serve to raise awareness that faculty are doing assessments all of the time
  - Remind faculty that assessment and making adjustments are part of sustaining quality instruction
  - Increase dialogue
  - Capture evidence

Goals: create a dialogue, increase communication, capture evidence

Process: identify faculty on the assessment committee to lead the distribution

Title Survey: "Starting a Dialogue"

Future plans: Establish a blog or website to share best practices. Possibly change the topic once a month.

Action: Joyce Ester will develop a "faux survey monkey" and send it out to ASC members.

Philosophy
Reviewed the draft philosophy statement. More active and fewer passive statements.   Work on one paragraph.

Action: Sue Granger-Dickson will incorporate suggestions and redistribute the draft via email. Feedback requested.

Getting the Message Out
Presentations have been made to FCDC, Academic Senate, and College Council.

Approved Minutes
January 25, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Joyce Ester, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Rachel Vickrey, Ann Morgan, and Hamid Eydgahi.

Absentees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Diana Kelly, Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman, Bernadette Towns, and Rene Trujillo.

New Members: Rebecca Mooney, SEC Co-chair; Sean Hill, SGA general counsel

1) Review and approve December 7, 2010 minutes

Minutes of December 7, 2010 were reviewed and approved with minor changes in attendance (Hamid Eydgahi and Ann Morgan were both present).

2) Report on action items from December 7 meeting (see minutes)

- **Timeline revision: LaMont discussed revisions for items 4, 5, and 6.**

- **Draft Accreditation Steering Committee Philosophy Statement - Reviewed and recommended a few edits – agreed this rewritten draft reads very well.**

- **Faux Survey Monkey for ASC members – Agreed to give to Becky as a tool to distribute to the appropriate committee, possibly Assessment Committee.**

3) Wrap up of semester's accomplishments—end-of-term report for College President and Academic Senate. Some ideas to get us started:
- Attended ACCJC training.
- Reviewed recommendations, planning agendas, and Midterm Report 2009.
- Met with co-chairs of IEC, Curriculum, and Assessment.
- Developed SEC charge and faculty co-chair job description.
- Working to embed accreditation in college life with reports to
  - College Council
  - Academic Senate
  - FCDC
  - Board of Trustees
- Developing philosophy.

More accomplishments included:
- Flex Workshop with CurricUNET demonstration at beginning of fall semester
- Created multi-year timeline of accreditation tasks and events
- Developed calendar for AY 2010-11 and AY 2011-12
- Developed template for recording evidence
- 4-page handout describing standards

Action Item: Kate will bring a revised list of accomplishments to the next meeting.

4) Review status of SEC

Status of Volunteers: Becky entered the information from the sign-up sheets distributed Opening Day into a matrix.

Call for Participation – Reviewed draft "Help celebrate and improve BC!" email asking for collegewide participation. Becky will send this to bc_all January 31 (Census Day).

5) Identify process for addressing issues referred to ASC.
   When items or issues are referred to us, what process or criteria will we use to determine if we should solve the problem or refer it to another group or person? If we are the appropriate group to problem solve, what do we do with our solution? Is it a recommendation? If so, where is it sent?

Agreed ASC will review issues on a case-by-case basis and decide upon the appropriate referral for the issue.

6) First issue referred to ASC:
   What is the purpose of the Unit Plan and Program Review processes?
   How are they related? Should they be related? If so, how?
   Establish college definition of a program.
   Unit plan template: http://bakersfieldcollege.edu/irp/Unit%20Plan/a1_UnitPlan.asp
   Program review template: see email

ASC will review this when the IEC Co-chair is able to attend.

Action Item: Ann will send the Master Planning Processes Timeline to ASC after the February 8 meeting.

7) Things to think about
   a) How we communicate with standing committees
   b) How we develop/design/update a website
   c) How we help to improve college communication

8) Adjourn

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 8, 2011
                       3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Collins Conference Center

Accreditation Steering Committee
Approved Minutes
February 8, 2011
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Kate Pluta (co-chair), Joyce Ester, Hamid Eydgahi, Sue Granger-Dickson, Sean Hill. Rebecca Mooney (SEC co-chair), Ann Morgan, Kirk Russell, Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Diana Kelly, Klint Rigby, LaMont Schiers, Bonnie Suderman

Recorder: Candice Sifuentes

1) Review and approve January 25, 2010 minutes

Minutes of January 25, 2010 were reviewed and approved with minor changes to the correct spelling of Rene's name and Sean Hill's SGA title. Sean Hill's SGA title is SGA General Counsel.

2) Report on action items from January 25 meeting
   Kate will bring a revised list of accomplishments

The Fall 2010 ASC Accomplishments were distributed. Included in the list was the progress made on College Goal #7. It was agreed that this list would be the second quarterly report from ASC to the Academic Senate and College Council.

Action: Kate to send second quarterly report to the Academic Senate. Kate will give the second quarterly report to the College Council at their next meeting.

3) Philosophy

Suggested changes to the philosophy were distributed to the group. The document suggested to break the philosophy statement up into three paragraphs and to change some wording. The committee agreed to change the first sentence to read, "The Bakersfield College Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC), a standing governance committee, ensures that the accreditation or self-evaluation process is woven into the fabric of college activity with its focus on the improvement of student learning and success." After further discussion on paragraph two it was decided that Ann and Sue would continue to work on the philosophy statement and send it out to the committee Thursday afternoon (Feb. 10th) for comments. Comments are to be sent to the group prior to the next meeting. Comments on the statement will be "reconciled" at the next meeting so that the philosophy statement may be moved forward to the Academic Senate and the College Council for review.

Action: Ann and Sue to work on philosophy statement then send the statement out to the committee by Thursday (Feb. 10th) afternoon for comment.

Action: Committee members to review revised philosophy statement and send comments via e-mail back to the committee no later than <u>Monday (Feb. 14th) at noon</u>.

4) **Review status of SEC**
   Review participation; identify potential faculty co-chairs and contact.

An updated matrix of SEC volunteers was distributed to the committee. A correction was noted that for Standard II.A. that one of the administrators serving should be Joyce Coleman, not Joyce Ester. After the "Call for Participation" e-mail was sent on January 31st only five additional people volunteered to participate. A list of participating administrators (yet to be added to the matrix) sent by Greg Chamberlain and a list of participants from the 2006 self study was also distributed to the committee for review. SGA President Lisa English has been solicited for student volunteers. There is one student interested who will need to be approved to serve by the SGA. It was announced that ASC members may also serve on standards.

A brief discussion was held as to who (faculty or administration) should recruit faculty. It was suggested that if administration recruited faculty that perhaps it may be perceived by the faculty member that they were being "strong-armed" onto the SEC standard.

The committee brainstormed how to get faculty involved. Ideas ranging from going to department meetings to approaching them in person were suggested. If faculty co-chairs were in place they would probably recruit others to serve on their standard. The committee then began to brainstorm who to approach to co-chair each standard and came up with the following:

Standard I.A.	Kathy Rosellini (Sue to contact her)
	Christian Parker (back-up if Kathy declines)
Standard I.B.	David Koeth (Bernadette to contact him)
	Assessment Committee members (back-up)
Standard II.A.	Klint Rigby - CTE (Sue to contact him)
	Jennifer Johnson (back-up if Klint declines)
	Dawn Dobie - Gen Ed. (Kirk to contact her)
Standard II.B.	Barbara Braid (Rachel to contact her)
Standard II.C.	Nancy Guidry (Kirk to contact her)

Standard III.A.	Leah Carter (Bernadette to contact her) Lynn Krausse (back-up if Leah declines)
Standard III.B.	Mike Daniel (Rachel to contact him)
Standard III.C.	Tim Bohan (Rebecca to contact him) Phil Whitney (back-up if Tim declines)
Standard III.D.	Kris Toler (Rachel to contact him)
Standard IV.A.	Tom Moran (Rebecca to contact him)
Standard IV.B.	John Gerhold (Rebecca to contact him)

Additional faculty identified to serve on the standards were:

Standard I.A.	Sue Granger-Dickson
Standard I.B.	Bernadette Towns
Standard III.A.	Matt Morgan (Rene to contact him)
Standard III.B.	Randy Beeman (Rebecca to contact him) Joyce Kirst (Rebecca to contact her)
Standard III.D.	Isabelle Stierle (Rebecca to contact her) Chad Newton (Rebecca to contact him)

Action: Kirk to recruit all librarians to a SEC standard.

Action: Committee members to contact faculty assigned and e-mail the results to Rebecca as soon as possible.

Action: Rebecca will then email confirmed co-chairs to the group before the meeting.

5) Training for Co-Chairs

The ASC will be providing training to the SEC co-chairs. Multiples sessions of training will probably have to be offered because most likely not all co-chairs will be able to attend the same meeting. Worksheet packets have been put together for the co-chairs of each standard. They consist of the four ways of looking at a standard. The flow of the packets is: audience, standard, questions and wrap-up.

Training for the co-chairs will include expectations of the co-chairs and deadlines for work. Rebecca will meet with them periodically.

Training for co-chairs was tabled until the next ASC meeting

Action: ASC members should be thinking about what should be included in training co-chairs and when would be a good time to hold the training.

6) Report on January 11-13, 2011 Commission Meeting

This report reflects all the visits made and mid-term reports, follow-up reports, and closure reports turned in this past fall. The Commission met in January to determine what institutional actions to make on these visits and reports. The results of their meeting were contained in the handout. It was pointed out that 13 colleges went through the Comprehensive Evaluation and only six of them had their accreditation reaffirmed. The report showed that there are many categories that the Commission could place a college in. It was noted that follow-up reports are fairly common.

BC's SEC will be working on the comprehensive evaluation.

7) First issue referred to ASC (tabled until IEC co-chair, Diana Kelly returns):
     What is the purpose of the Unit Plan and Program Review processes?
     How are they related? Should they be related? If so, how?
     Unit plan template: http://bakersfieldcollege.edu/irp/Unit%20Plan/a1_UnitPlan.asp
     Program review template: see e-mail

The IEC may need a new name since it does Program Reviews. The Unit Plan and Program Review and how they "drive" the budget needs to be examined. Ideally these two documents will be one that occurs annually. The document would "look forward and back" with the review portion occurring every 6th year. What happens to Program Review recommendations also needs to be looked at. This needs to be completed by the end of May. Tabled until March 1st.

Action: Ann and Rachel will prepare a topic sheet on Unit Plans and Program Review for the March 1st meeting.

8) Thing to think about
     a) How we communicate with standing committees
     b) How we develop/design/update a website
     c) How we help to improve college communication

a.) Kate sent out an e-mail to all faculty co-chairs of governance committees. She does not know if they've communicated anything to their committees.

b) Nick Strobel has put a website under the College Council website for the ASC. There is also one off of the Accreditation page that will be in BC format and internal. This webpage may or may not be password protected. The webpage will contain a link for each of the standard committees. Share Point Portal technology is also being looked at for this.

c) We will focus on improving communication with websites, phone calls, and face-to-face communication.

9) Adjourn

Next Meeting: **Tuesday, February 15th, 2011**
                                3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Lisa English (SGA President), Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Rebecca Mooney (co-chair), Ann Morgan, Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Renee Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Klint Rigby, Sean Hill, Diana Kelly, Bonnie Suderman

1. Review and approve February 8, 2011 minutes

The minutes dated February 8, 2011 were reviewed and approved with minor changes to the last sentence, on the last page, that reads, "We can improve communication with the website, "carrots" and face to face communication". The sentence will be changed to "We will focus on improving communication with websites, phone calls, and face-to-face participation".

2. Report on action items from February 8, 2011 meeting

a). Kate has sent the second quarterly report to the Academic Senate and College Council

b). The philosophy statement was sent to the ASC committee for final review and comments

3. Philosophy
The philosophy statement was reviewed by the committee and agreed to move forward with the statement as is.

Action: Kate will forward a copy of the philosophy statement to Academic Senate

4. Review status of SEC
The list of standards and names listed below are the names of faculty that were suggested by the committee to serve on the assigned SEC committee during the February 8, 2011 meeting. An update is provided regarding the status of these positions:

Standard I.A. Mission:
Kathy Rosellini (Chair)
Christian Parker (back-up – unsure if he will be able to participate)
Sue Granger-Dickson

Standard I.B. Institutional Effectiveness:
David Koeth (Chair)
Assessment Committee members (back-up)
Bernadette Towns

Standard II.A. Instructional Programs:
Klint Rigby - CTE (Sue to contact him – waiting to hear from Klint)
Jennifer Johnson (back-up if Klint declines)
Dawn Dobie - Gen Ed. (is not able to participate)
Lydia Torres (Sue to contact her)

Standard II.B. Student Support Services:
Barbara Braid (Chair)
Nancy Guidry (Co-Chair ?)

Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services:
Nancy Guidry (Kirk to contact her)

Standard III.A. Human Services:
Leah Carter (Chair)
Lynn Krausse (back-up if Leah declines)
Matt Morgan (Rene to contact him)
Valerie Robinson (Rebecca to contact her)

Standard III.B. Physical Resources:
Mike Daniel (Rachel to contact him)
Randy Beeman (Rebecca to contact him)
Joyce Kirst (Rebecca to contact her)
Jack Pierce (Rebecca to contact him)
Phil Whitney - ?

Standard III.C. Technology Resources:
Tim Bohan (Chair)
Phil Whitney (back-up if Tim declines)

Standard III.D. Financial Resources:
Kris Toler (Rachel to contact him)
Isabelle Stierle (Rebecca to contact her)
Chad Newton (Rebecca to contact him)
Phil Whitney - ?

Standard IV.A. Decision Making Roles and Processes:
Tom Moran (Rebecca to contact him)

Standard IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization:
John Gerhold (Rebecca to contact him)

Action: Rebecca will contact Corny Rodriguez to suggest names to serve on the Financial committee.

Action: Rebecca will contact Nick Strobel to serve as co-chair for one of the remaining Standards if Klint Rigby is unable to participate.

Action: Rebecca to send out another "call out" email for the remaining open committee positions that include: Physical Resources, Financial Resources, and Instructional Programming.

5. Training for chairs
Training for chairs will consist of more than one session where both the Chair and Co-Chair of the committee attend together. A meeting will be scheduled prior to the end of the spring semester to decide how much time will be dedicated for each SEC committee. It is anticipated that fall semester will be the busiest for chairs to prepare for the December report due date.

Nan suggested that administrators go back and review the email sent from Greg regarding the administrators he assigned for each committee.

Action: Becky is to send an email to the faculty members listed as duplicates on the list of standards to ask them which they would be most interested in.

Action: Vickie will provide copies of the standard packet for the March 1, 2011 meeting.

6. First issue referred to ASC (tabled until IEC co-chair, Diana Kelly returns)
>   What is the purpose of the Unit Plan and Program Review processes?
>   How are they related? Should they be related? If so,how?
>   Establish college definition of a program.
>   Unit plan template:
http://bakersfieldcollege.edu/irp/Unit%20Plan/a1_UnitPlan.asp
>   Program review template: see email

7. Things to think about:
1. Ann is suggesting a strong consideration to using SharePoint when deciding on the software for the ASC website. Rebecca said that Kate will be reporting what program will be used at the next College Council meeting.

2. Lisa said that advertising to recruit student participation is being placed around campus.

Action: Lisa will send ASC a list of the names of students interested in serving on a committee

3. Lisa mentioned a February 26th Future Leadership For Students meeting sponsored by the United Way from 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. and encouraged everyone to attend.

4. Cabrillo College and West Hills College were recognized for their outstanding Self-Study reports.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 1, 2011
                              3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
                              Collins Conference Center

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Approved Minutes
March 1, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Sean Hill (SGA General Council), Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Renee Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Sue Granger-Dickson and Bonnie Suderman

1. Review and approve February 15, 2011 minutes

• The minutes dated February 15, 2011 were reviewed and approved with minor changes that include the following: Becky suggested the mention of Cabrillo College and West Hills College for their outstanding Self-Study reports.

• The 'training for chairs' item number 5 reads "Nan suggested that administrators go back and review the email sent from Greg regarding the <u>faculty</u> he assigned for each committee." The word *faculty* needs to be changed to 'administrators.' The last sentence in item number 5 that reads "Then send an email to the faculty members listed as duplicates..", is to be made an action item that reads: Becky is to send an email to the faculty members listed as duplicates on the list of standards to ask them which they would be most interested in.

• Number 4 'Review status of SEC' under Standard II.A. Instructional Programs lists Dawn Dobie – Gen Ed. (may be able if she has a back-up) is written incorrectly. It should read Dawn Dobie – Gen Ed. (is not able to participate)

• Number 7 'Things to think about' 1. Ann suggested using SharePoint.. is to be changed to "Ann is suggesting a strong consideration to using SharePoint when deciding on the software for the ASC website."

2. Report on action items from February 15, 2011 meeting

a). Kate presented the philosophy statement to Academic Senate Executive Board, which provided feedback. They asked for the meaning behind the first sentence of the last paragraph that reads, "The committee identifies and evaluates problem areas." The committee reviewed the feedback and made minor changes to include in the discussions with the Academic Senate on Wednesday and College Council on Friday.

b). Becky will contact Corny Rodriguez to suggest names to serve on the financial committee - was not addressed in this meeting.

c). Becky contacted Nick Strobel and Nick said he wanted to be on all three of the committees but would not chair any of them.

d). Becky sent out another 'call out' email to recruit for the remaining open committee positions for Physical Resources, Financial Resources, and Instructional Programming.

e). Copies of the Standard packets were distributed to ASC committee.

f). Becky sent an email to the faculty members listed as duplicates for each standard to ask them which they would be most interested in serving.

g). SGA will send a list of students interested in serving on a committee to ASC - this was not addressed in this meeting.

3. Website - Update

Kate met with Dave Barnett and Todd Coston to discuss the website expected to be up and running as soon as possible. The plan is for everything to be available electronically (minutes, ASC and SEC documents and working documents, other campus documents) etc. Several options were discussed on how to proceed in the most efficient way possible for public and campus access. Dave is going to set up a pilot website through SharePoint to work from first using ASC & SEC documents that will be password protected. This software will allow many users to work from the same document. The public page portion of the website will have general documents that are not password protected. Once the website is up and running the SharePoint documents will be available for accreditation site visitors to have access.

4. Philosophy Statement – Update

Academic Senate gave feedback regarding the 'highlighted' sentence in the philosophy statement (hand out) that says, "The committee identifies and evaluates problem areas." Kate asked for suggestions regarding the meaning of the sentence.

The discussion of changing the sentence to "evaluates organizational challenges" in place of "evaluates problem areas" was suggested. Also, using samples of the type of organizational challenges, such as keeping the public folders updated was said to indicate opportunities of improvement.

The third sentence in the second paragraph of the philosophy statement reads, "The ASC uses evidence gathered by the college community to identify areas in

need of improvement and makes recommendations…" clearly identifies the meaning of the first sentence of the last paragraph highlighted in the statement. A suggestion to take out the highlighted sentence was discussed.

The need of an internal college community organizational system that could be utilized by each department was identified as a good way to address 'organizational challenges'. SharePoint has this capability, although implementation of this type of model would be addressed in the future. Both Cabrillo College and West Hills College websites will be reviewed as a template as we continue to work through the BC pilot.

Another important discussion point involved the committee reviewing options in future meetings to the type of evidence that will be used, and where it will be available, as stated in the last sentence of the second paragraph in the philosophy statement.

5. Review status of SEC

Review of the handout (excel spreadsheet) of the last page of the document listed faculty by department. Most of the departments on campus can be accessed by using the 'employee directory' on the BC website.

Action: Becky will work with Nan to review the names of departments and include which departments will need to be added to the list.

The three areas that have not identified a co-chair are Instructional Programs, Physical Resources, and Financial Resources. A discussion of the diversity of volunteers involved in the SEC committee is reviewed by the site visit team, indicating the importance of recruiting people from many departments. A suggestion to recruit face to face may be more effective in filling these positions.

6. Review of Standard Packets
Packets of each standard were handed out to the ASC committee for review. IIA. Instructional Programs is one of the largest standards and should include at least two CTE faculty volunteers. The worksheet for IIA. consists of questions that need to be answered from page 8 through 17 by the SEC committee.
An example of what the SEC committee will have to discuss is found in question number 1 on page 8 asks, "How does the institution fit the study?". Hamid answered by stating that on the CTE side in the program review every other year a gap analysis is prepared that includes demand of employers in the community. The number of questions and amount of work indicates the urgency to recruit more individuals to the three standards without co-chairs.

Action: Nan will ask the deans to work with chairs to more directly recruit people from the departments that are not included on the list.

The possibility of a large group encouraging some to drop out leaving the remaining individuals to do all the work was discussed. Who decides the number of people on a committee? Becky said that many people signed up during opening day. An email from the co-chairs of the committee will have to decide the number of people involved in each SEC committee.

7. Training – Schedule/Timeline
The matter of scheduling training and timeline was discussed for the SEC committee co-chairs. The question of the assigned administrator getting trained in lieu of the vacant co-chair positions was discussed although the idea was thought to raise other issues, and it was decided that filling the vacant positions were necessary.

Other events on campus should be taken into consideration when scheduling training dates. A suggestion for a monthly calendar of campus events is needed to aid with future scheduling. The committee agreed that Monday, Thursday, and Friday would work for training dates and times.

Action: Kate and Becky will decide on possible dates and times and send to the ASC committee. Becky will also send out the agreed dates and times to the co-chairs of each committee.

Action: Kate will put together a training script and timeline together and send to the committee.

8. Things to think about

a). Next meeting - Unit Plans, Program Reviews, Budget – the committee is going to discuss how to integrate all three of these areas.
b). Planning Agendas – Rachel sent out worksheets for training. She suggests the committee think of 10 things that could be changed. The co-chairs will need to discuss evidence collection for the challenging problems on campus. Rachel indicated that one group should be looking at the consideration and collection of evidence. The goal is to have 10 planning agendas completed by September, 2011.

The question of who recruits district personnel was asked. Nan said the Vice Chancellor at the district, with the help of the campus President, recruits individuals. The co-chairs of these committees will have to work with all three campuses.

Action: Nan will talk with Greg regarding recruiting volunteers from the District level.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 8, 2011
                    3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Collins Conference Center

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
March 8, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, Sue Granger-Dickson, Sean Hill
(SGA General Council), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Ann Morgan,
Kate Pluta (co-chair), Rene Trujillo, Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Rachel
Vickrey

Absentees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman,
and Bernadette Towns

1. Review and approve March 1, 2011 minutes

- The minutes dated March 1, 2011 were reviewed and approved with no
  changes.

2. Report on action items from March 1, 2011 meeting

a). Becky met with Nan to review the SEC list of department names. Some
additions were made to the list. There are still 3 committees without co-chairs.
Becky passed out the most current list of participants.

b). Nan sent out an email to the deans to involve them in the recruitment of
the 3 committees without co-chairs. This action item is deferred until next
meeting to get a complete update from Nan.

c). The dates for co-chair training are: Tuesday, March 15 3:30-5:00 p.m. in
Levinson 40; Wednesday, March 16 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Collins Conference
Center; Friday, March 25 10:30 a.m.-12noon in Levinson 40; and an additional
date is added on Friday, March 18 1:00-2:30 p.m. tentatively in Levinson 40. All
meeting locations are to be confirmed.

d). Kate will send out training script and put timeline together to send to the
committee. This action item has not yet been completed.

e). Nan will contact Greg for recruiting volunteers from the District level.
LaMont said he briefly discussed this with Greg. This action item has not yet
been completed.

Action Items of March 8, 2011:

**Action: Nan is to give the committee an update regarding the email sent to
the deans for recruiting the 3 committees without co-chairs.**

Action: Becky will contact Steve Hageman to recruit him for IIA. Instructional Programs.

Action: Becky will contact Bernadette Towns to get a list of the Assessment Committee members.

Action: Nan will send a list to Becky of the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee members.

Action: Becky will send out all scheduled co-chair training dates to the SEC committee co-chairs.

Action: Kate will send out a training script and put timeline together to send to the committee.

Action: Nan will contact Greg regarding recruiting volunteers from the District level.

Action: Vickie to send the form provided to FCDC for Unit plan review and recommendations.

Action: Diana Kelly will forward a copy of the comments of Program Review to the ASC committee.

Action: Kate to get a copy of the Curriculum Review form from Janet Fulks.

Action: Vickie will send the form regarding faculty position requests to ASC.

Action: Kate will talk to Nan about scheduling another ASC meeting on March 22 or March 29.

Action: Kate will send out an email to committee regarding training.

Action: Kate will ask Greg to recruit the additional 3 faculty co-chairs.

Action: Sue will modify the strategic planning handout based on discussion today. Diana, Ann, Kirk, and Kate will work with her.

3. Calendar – update

Becky contacted Amber Chiang to work with her in developing a campus calendar to post on the BC website.

4. First issue referred to ASC

Diana Kelly and Ann Morgan had previously forward copies to the committee of the unit plan and program review forms as a focus of this discussion.

Unit Plans

Ann referred to the unit plan documents and said this was the 4th revision of the documents. A 'Unit Plan Task Force' was assembled to get feedback as to what should be included in the documents. The current version is the outcome of the feedback. This version of the document now asks for a resource request. It asks to summarize a units mission with a brief description. The main difference from the older version is it asks for a summary of previous years, asking to state whether needs were met, to giving a description of how their assessment results in planning and budget. The first year in 2010, is the first year, that assessing unit planning and budget were linked. The unit plan documents also ask the units to provide relevant program data; some of this data is available through the Institutional Research and Development department for service departments on campus, and others keep track of their own data. The document provides 'where to go' links for further information regarding the data that should be provided in the documents. The document asks to provide other information such as, a summary of how their planning pertains to college goals, strategic goals, and institution outcomes. It also has an area to list equipment and staffing needs, including the priority of the request, and a summary of the expected outcome if these needs are met for their unit.

Sue asked Ann about training departments in understanding and filling out the documents correctly. Ann said that departments are asked to contact her to schedule a meeting, and/or workshop, to provide such training.

Rachel asked what happens to the unit plans after they are prepared. Ann said they are reviewed with department chairs and deans and then submitted to Nan's office and FCDC for feedback and recommendations. LaMont stated the plans will be reviewed earlier this year, beginning in the fall, because of the budget request component for (2012-2013 year), which will be submitted to the budget committee. In past years, it went directly to the President. Ann keeps copies of all unit plans for the educational master plan and posts them to the web for public view.

Becky asked if campus decisions are made from the unit plan. Ann said the President uses these documents to make decisions from.

Program Review

Program review is on a 6 year cycle and typically due the year after curriculum review for the instructional programs. There are a number of problems with the IEC Program review documents in terms of asking the right questions on the form to receive complete information without duplicating answers.

Question B.3.c. Comparison with other programs – there are a number of programs from other colleges that include student learning - direct outcomes, and collaboration regarding curriculum. This includes other comparisons from other colleges on the form that may help answer this question.

Question C. Summary analysis of enrollment, indirect outcomes, and productivity trends – How to interpret data they receive may be a result of not answering this question correctly.

Question D. Required resources (budget area D.1. and D.2.) – these questions should be revised to clarify the information we are asking, so that it is better understood. The asterisk in D.2. explains why additional resources are needed in one or two paragraphs. If this question is not answered, IEC will find it hard to support the need for this area.

Question E.7. List the required resource needs in priority order – could be combined with question D.2. because it factors in needs and trends for the future.

Question E.8. Develop plan of action and timeline – this is usually answered in a one or two year plan. The importance of the plan needs to emphasized.

IEC isn't pleased with the in formation on the (3b and 3c) of the purpose and goals of program, because it sometimes doesn't get answered at all. In area C. brief data will be provided; budget area D. doesn't make sense to the committee, which in turn doesn't make sense to those answering the questions. Diana stated she has tried to get a sub committee to address these issues for help with modifications. Many changes can be done and feedback is encouraged.

Areas with duplications:

1. Question B3.f Curricular barriers – IEC receives duplicate information from Question E.2, E.3, and E.6.
2. Question E.2. Factors and trends and Question E.3. Describe general plans are both similar to Question A.3.b. regarding strengths of the program and Question D.2. that asks about additional resources (budget).

3. Question E.6.b. innovative use of technology is similar to Question B.3.g. describe use of innovate technology.

5. Data on program review

Kate discussed the handout of program review to include: course outlines/syllabi showing intended learning outcomes and assessment methods; catalogues showing program goals and learning outcomes; budget showing adequate resources; policies on curricular review; and evidence of regular course review and improvement.

6. Notes of meeting with Nan

Kate met with Nan to discuss the following:

1. The annual review should be more inclusive in terms of information that is provided. CTE and Allied Health programs use their own reviews for outside accreditation. Both these programs can use a summary sheet of their own review, rather than duplicating the information on a different form.
2. Program review is part of the educational master plan. The program review summary should have more in depth analysis data. The document doesn't need to be longer.
3. The committee needs to provide strategies for department chairs
4. The committee needs to review all disciplines that teach basic skills (Gen Ed/transfer and CTE programs) to see how they relate to each other. For example, student support services and operational services would meet to discuss planning and program reviews to link these areas. The idea is to formally require working together on campus to improve student outcomes. The committee will have to come up with ideas to accomplish this.
5. The idea is to integrate annual review, curriculum review, and program review into one. From there, a decision needs to be made on how these will be presented.

Rachel suggested that program reviews could be done every 3 years, with alternate due dates, such as before curriculum review. This would allow integration to take place by incorporating program review and unit plans together. If, a group is completing a program review, they wouldn't have to complete a unit plan for the year.

Kurt asked if we as a college are allowed to establish our own timelines. Kate confirmed we are able to do so.

Hamid suggested gathering information that shows a trend of a 5 year plan that show a true analysis of data on campus.

Ann indicated that Chaffey College is a college that used an earlier version of the CurriCUNET module and has changed program reviews to 3 year cycles.

A brief summary: After program review is reviewed by the IEC committee, the committee brings the program reviews to College Council to receive recommendations, commendations, and budget allocations.

Kurt asked who accepts the program review documents. Ann confirmed that she keeps them in her office.

7. Strategic Planning

Sue discussed the strategic planning handout. Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) will have to change the program review name. Sue discussed the changes that occur with environmental scan, jobs, and occupational readiness, to name a few, by looking at a 3 year plan. A 3 year plan would capture some of the changes made through the years. The program review committee works with all groups to identify common themes, resources, and priorities. A list of strategies and training for department chairs could be organized. The data for student success with suggestions needs to be the focus of program review. Who does program review report to? The combination of program review/budget meetings would have input from faculty, staff, and administrators to one area.

Rachel suggested that curriculum review be added to the handout.

8. ASC Schedule

Kate said the next meeting is scheduled for April 12, but would like to schedule another meeting on March 22 or 29th.

9. Philosophy statement

The committee received a positive response from College Council regarding the philosophy statement. College Council committee will ask Academic Senate to vote (must have consensus) to move forward, as is, at their next meeting.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 2011
                     3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Sue Granger-Dickson, Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney, Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Joyce Ester, Hamid Eydaghi, Sean Hill (SGA General Council), Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman

1. Review and approve March 8, 2011 minutes

- The minutes dated March 8, 2011 were reviewed and approved with minor changes:
- Change Kurt Russell to Kirk Russell
- Number 5. Data on program review; currently reads "Kate discussed the handout of program review to include". Change to "Kate discussed the ACCJC program review handout to include."

2. Report on action items from March 29, 2011 meeting

a). The issue of recruiting 3 SEC co-chairs has been resolved.

b). Becky was unable to get a hold of Steve Hageman. The SEC group for IIA. Instructional Programs will recruit additional members, as needed.

c). Becky contacted Bernadette Towns and she will be bringing a list of Assessment Committee members to today's meeting.

d). Nan will send Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names. This action item has not yet been completed.

e). A total of 4 training sessions for the SEC committee co-chairs were scheduled and one individual meeting was planned.

f). A training script has been prepared and will be revised based on feedback from the co-chair training sessions. Kate will send the revised script to the ASC committee and SEC co-chairs. This action item has not yet been completed.

g). Nan will review the email sent from Greg to recruiting volunteers from the District level. This action has not yet been completed.

h). Vickie reviewed the process and a form does not exist for FCDC to review and provide recommendations for Unit Plans.

i). Diana has sent a copy of the Program Review comments to the ASC committee.

j). Kate spoke with Janet Fulks and Janet Oldham, and there are no polices and procedures written for curriculum review.

k). Vickie sent the form to the ASC committee regarding faculty position requests.

l). Kate spoke with Nan regarding an additional ASC meeting. The remaining scheduled meetings of the semester are: March 29, April 12, April 26, and May 10.

m). Kate sent out an email regarding training to the committee.

n). All 3 SEC faculty co-chairs have been recruited.

o). Sue modified the strategic planning handout.

Action Items of March 29, 2011:

Action: Nan will send Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names.

Action: Becky will send out all scheduled co-chair training dates to the SEC committee co-chairs.

Action: A training script has been prepared and will be revised based on feedback from the co-chair training sessions. Kate will send the revised script to the ASC committee and SEC co-chairs.

Action: Rachel to speak with Kimberly Van Horne regarding a form template of procedures, instructions, and training for focus groups.

Action: Ann will research campus websites for a template of campus communication reporting for program reviews.

Action: Becky will ask Klint Rigby if he is interested in being added to the committee.

3. SEC update – Becky Mooney

Becky reported that all SEC co-chair positions have been filled. Additional people have been added to SEC committees: Jennifer Johnson to Instructional Programs, Phil Whitney to Physical Resources, and John Hart to Financial Services.

All SEC co-chair teams have been trained and the script will be revised based on feedback notes from these training sessions. The co-chairs will be meeting with their committees; and a meeting has been scheduled with Bonnie Suderman and the subcommittee co-chairs on April 29, 11:30 – 12:30. The co-chairs were told they can recruit additional people for their committees as long as the names are sent to ASC for approval.

4. Calendar for remaining meetings of the year – Kate Pluta

A few things we should think about for the remaining time left this semester:

• 3rd Quarterly Report
• Moving forward with Program Review (receiving feedback from FCDC, College Council, the Budget committee, and the Senate)
• Schedule Flex training for August
• Additional SharePoint training from Todd Coston. Developing forms that co-chairs fill in through the SharePoint program.

Assessment was discussed with some suggestions as to what important data should be reviewed and what reports currently exist for providing training and workshops. A suggestion was made to schedule a workshop with Ann Morgan and the Assessment Committee for this purpose. Also, to consider bringing focus groups together for conducting surveys; incorporate questions that SEC sub-committees could include in these surveys; and using forms to receive feedback regarding problems, should all be a part of the workshop.

5. Program Review

A draft of the Program Review Process (PRP) Kate handed out is a result of discussions linking program review, budget processes, and planning. The Integrated Program Review would provide strategies for each department on how to complete comprehensive program reviews that incorporates the mission of the college, and how to better communicate to all departments on campus. For example, Basic Skills fit into other departments besides Academic Development, such as Math, English, and ESL. The idea is to get all departments to communicate with each other on how to improve student success. To streamline the process and to avoid all being due at the same time, each program review can alternate each year, such as English. They would

participate in both the Basic Skills and General Ed/Transfer Integrated Program Reviews.

Feedback needs to be provided from College Council and a process for feedback needs to be implemented annually. A suggestion was made for a yearly campus report to be distributed to College Council and Budget Committee, so that it can be communicated to the campus. The report would include themes, issues, resource requests, and priorities from the year's review.

Another suggestion was made to include 'best practices' on the annual form from each department. The departments might also include the top three strengths of their department and why, with suggestions as to how other departments can use these suggestions. Best practices could also include a list of questions that ask about department processes that could be used by other departments on campus related to the College mission.

Concerns were also discussed regarding the amount of work for the IEC committee with the implementation of the new process, and with changing the IEC Committee name to Program Review Committee. A suggestion was made to change the name Integrated Program Review (IPR) committee instead.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 2011
                     3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Collins Conference Center

<div align="center">

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
April 12, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Levinson 40

</div>

Attendees: Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney, Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Sean Hill (SGA General Council), Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman, Rene Trujillo

1. Review and approve March 29, 2011 minutes – Minutes approved with no changes

2. Report on action items from March 29, 2011 meeting

a). Nan will send Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names. This action item has not yet been completed.

b). Becky has sent all scheduled co-chair training dates to the SEC committee co-chairs.

c). The revised training script has been completed and sent to ASC committee and SEC co-chairs.

d). Rachel has spoken with Kimberly and Regina. They suggested a 90 minute workshop for training during flex week.

e). Ann has researched campus websites for additional information regarding program review communication.

f). Becky will ask Klint Rigby if he is interested in being added to the committee. This action item has not yet been completed.

3. Action items from April 12, 2011 meeting

Action: Becky will ask the SEC co-chairs meeting on April 29 the type of focus groups they are interested in.

Action: ASC committee - schedule a flex workshop on conducting focus groups.

Action: ASC committee – Send Kate feedback regarding changes to the Annual Program Review (APR) handout by 11:00 a.m. Wednesday, April 13

Action: Nan will send Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names.

Action: Becky will ask Klint Rigby if he is interested in being added to the committee.

3. Calendar – Kate Pluta

Kate sent a calendar to the committee regarding campus meetings (i.e. FCDC, College Council, etc.) for ASC to focus on timeline constraints.

4. Integrated Program Review (IPR) and Annual Program Review (APR) – Kate Pluta

Kate reported sending the Integrated Program Review (IPR) handout (Draft 7) to the curriculum committee for feedback. The IPR handed out in today's ASC meeting (Draft 8) is the latest copy to include these updates.

The Annual Program Review (APR) handout (Draft 8) emailed to ASC committee for discussion at today's meeting also includes the latest updates.

Annual Program Review (APR) - Handout

Who prepares it?
A suggestion was made to include online or Distance Education as one of the clusters.

What does the APR look like?
Include best practices regarding the evaluating process in order to receive feedback right away.

What must it reference?
Propose a question – What is the department doing for student success? Adding this question will help capture information regarding their retention rate and the areas that need improvement.

As a follow-up, a survey could be conducted campus wide to receive feedback regarding the results from 'the areas that need improving'.

A suggestion was made to include items from each department that don't cost money for improvement.

A suggestion was made to generalize the language/questions on the form to make it applicable for all departments on campus.

Who responds to it?
A suggestion was made to add the ISIT committee.

A question was asked if faculty requests for departments were going to be included on the document. If so, could the faculty request form be attached to the program review?

A suggestion was made to have representatives from each committee listed, so that different people will have a chance to be a part of it.

A suggestion of 1 committee read both Annual Program Reviews and Integrated Program Reviews to concentrate on recommendations.

A suggestion was made to schedule a flex workshop on how to fill out the forms for Annual Program Reviews and Integrated Program Reviews.

How do they respond to it?
A suggestion was made to match the questions we want to ask from each department with a summary response on the rubric.

The rubric should also include supporting and advancing student success information by prioritizing requests, include data back-up, and finally include improvements needed for each department.

Who gets the response?
Just the department should receive a copy of the rubric and synthesis.

The reporting process should include all the committees (Academic Senate, Admin Council, etc.), campus community (public folders), and a process for feedback needs to be included.

How is it reported to the college community?
It is reported through College Council representatives that inform the campus community via email.

How does it link to the budget?
The budget timeline for most districts is the academic year and should be completed by the beginning of May. It was suggested the budget distribution be in October for everyone to review until the end of January.

The Annual Program Review is currently due in October and recommendations are submitted by end of December for integration in the spring.

Who responds to it?
Decision makers

Integrated Program Review (IPR) - Handout
This item will be discussed at the next meeting.
Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 10th - 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
April 26, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Levinson 40

Attendees: Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney, Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Sean Hill (SGA General Council), Ann Morgan, Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman, Bernadette Towns

1. Review and approve April 12, 2011 minutes – Minutes approved with no changes

2. Report on action items from April 12, 2011 meeting

a). Nan sent Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names.

b). Becky met on April 29 regarding focus groups. Becky sent an email regarding the co-chair meeting announcements.

c). ASC committee – schedule a flex workshop on conducting focus groups.

d). ASC committee – Kate did receive feedback and has sent it back out to committee with revisions. She has also taken it to the Senate and College Council for review.

e). Becky has tried to contact Klint Rigby to ask him if he is interested in being added to the committee.

3. Action items from April 26, 2011 meeting

Action: Kate will bring a 3rd Quarterly Report (end of the year summary) to the next meeting on April 26.

Action: Add item on the agenda for the co-chairs meeting Friday April 29 – bring catalogs to the meeting to discuss General Education

Action: Nan to send the wording on the Integrated Program Review (IPR) process

3. Calendar

Kate proposed moving the ASC meeting to Monday afternoons (weekly) in the Fall 2011. Comments from committee: ISIT may conflict once a month with a Monday change; counseling meetings are held once a month during the same time frame; Nan has a meeting on the 2nd Monday that will conflict. Another proposal included alternating dates.

Kate proposed creating a calendar for next fall that includes campus meetings that occur each month. Many people are committed to various committees on campus and having a calendar would make it easier.

4. Integrated Program Review (IPR)

Draft 9 dated April 14, 2011 is reviewed by the committee to discuss the content.

A suggestion was made to add online (distance education) courses to the draft with the transfer general education cluster or as a stand-alone.

The Annual Program Review (APR) was taken to College Council and online distance education was suggested.

Who prepares it?

The Administrative Services cluster will have to work on it. For example, a topic for that year will have to be decided. The topic could be an issue or an institutional outcome. The report would include where they are currently and where they would like to be. The closing of the loop is the outcome of the research summarized in an objective report to be evaluated.

This structure of reporting will enable better communication on campus with the focus of one topic at a time. The communication dialog would take place between clusters (i.e. basic skills, CTE, library, etc). The outcome successively helps students in making career choices.

Discussion forums could be staged as a frame to get their conversations started.

The Annual Program Review (APR), the Integrated Program Review (IPR) will still need to be completed, but the IPR would come up every 'x' number of years. A cluster IPR would not be due every year. It was suggested we look at each cluster each year through the reporting process, so that items can be carried over into the next year, with the goal of being pro-active. The communication connection is made through people teaching particular courses, talking with others that teach the same courses.

Another suggestion was to have a college wide discussion regarding compressed classes (team teaching).

The clusters will have to determine ideas that will be used as a framework.

What does the IPR look like?
Mostly identification depending on the clusters – items that could be included are questions that answer what we are currently doing, what we are doing with assessment, and do we improve what we are doing.

This can be linked to the annual plan by taking what was learned from the IPR and including it in the APR. The link will address an overview of accountability.

Instructional areas can be a section itself that would fit into the annual program review – answers the number of students taking the course. In addition, the instructional areas could include a holistic perspective (clusters learning about departments and how they compliment each other toward student success) of the courses that lists degrees offered, certificates offered, etc.

The topic is to be decided by the clusters. A suggestion was made to review assessment as a foundation to review common areas. A facilitator will need to decide group priorities and issues that may connect with other clusters. The questions will be decided by members of the cluster.

Timeline: Fall brainstorming meeting to focus on items they will integrate into their annual report in the spring.

ASC May 10, 2011

1. review minutes – Changed Rachel – wasn't in the last meeting

The committee decided to schedule limitation for 2012-13 APR.

#3 To number of three action items: should be May 10, 2011 two number 3.

Take off absentee list – Ann Morgan

With a few corrections.

2. action items – still working on them

b. action item – pull them and send them out right away

c. nan sent the wording on IPR process:

3. Approved by the senate last Wednesday - APR – make it so was the terminiology. We need to include CTE external forms.
Who finishes (develops) the forms? Include in minutes – faculty chairs, reps , attend fcdc – suggest that fcdc pilot it.

12.1 May 9, 2011

What does APR look like? It includes the mechanisms – feedback received today include curriculum review, not as a separate item. Curriculum is ongoing not every six years.

Did you add any prerequisites? Uses current unit plan with limited additional questions – add red items on draft

Which if your courses need to be modified – reviewed? A question that could be added. Document what has occurred.

This will not replace course review every six years? Responses could be more broad affecting program outcome and not the course.

Review form – bullets under APR look like? These items would be listed as a yes we did, not it has not been doing. Includes an overview.

New – replace hiring classified and staff – fcdc ranks the request. A group (reps) needs to work this out.

Evaluates the APR process is now listing What did you find beneficial about this process?

What does it reference May 20 – budget –meeting

Composition of the committee – has gone thorugh senate and college council. The representation staff, faculty, administration is well represented.

How do they respond to it?
Rubric currently change to checklist based on college goals, budget criteria, etc… This wording would be more appropriate to review commonality and it is a quick process.

Second bullet - , included which will help organize the IPR cycle. To capture ideas and feedback.

Who responds to the summary response?
Question college council – is there two different responses – no. added in discussion and the college president in writing.

We have pieces of the CTE, nursing, ISIT forms we need to think of next step

Program review – from last meeting – work group need to train the program review members. Concern with appropriate training to understand the process.

Need more feedback on the checklist, so they can start working on it this fall.

Who conducts training? – task group trains program review committee.
The task force would use this draft as a template to know what to question.

A draft of the form itself? How do we go about developing the form.

Timeline for form: suggests that get the task group be familiar with information;

Action: Budget criteria to try and get a budget representative; FCDC meeting Friday could also recruit individuals for the task force.

Sue, becky, volunteered to be involved in putting form together – this is a modification from the existing form. Current unit plan form. The criteria will be added college goals and budget. Isit portion already revised. Need a CTE rep in this group.

Does not need to have duplicate information and is not to be a bigger document.

Retention and success – what about enrollment, completion of process –

Include someone from assessment on the task force.

Action: program review, budget, curriculum, assessment, college council – need someone from these areas. Joint email targets each area, administrators, co-chairs, and a more open call for senate to send out for faculty and classified.

FCDC and budget committee this Friday to ask for volunteers.

Continued to look for input - working group – for the summer.

Action: schedule a meeting next week include organizational meeting – Kate to send out draft email regarding this.

Filling out the form - the discussion of the data with the group would be an easy process – not time action draft email to recruit people and contact corny to get.

Action: committee to give feedback to Kate right away.

Items that are in the CTE reports could help with the review. The components for student success – they are part of the college goals, and we want to make sure this is included.

Question 12.1 draft – how do they respond to it? Who gets the

Data from the checklist included in the who gets the summary? Does it include the checklist? The feedback is based on what is needed from each department. The program review reviews all unit plans – need checklist – of the common things people are requesting (summary). Including the budget requests isn't helpful. A summary of what is needed on campus is more helpful (broader).

The individual checklist that go to unit make them available internally in case P

Questions – will be narrowed to include not only budget, but info that is in unit plans.

Attendees: nan, kate, becky, ann, Rachel, sue, Diana, kirk, joyce ester, hamid, and LaMont.

The president responds in writing from the summary response.

Quarterly Report – review - May 9, 2011

Accomplishments:
Will include enrollment management and EOADC – first bullet – met for the purpose of_____
Developed philosophy statement – approved by academic senate and college council.
Proposal was approved – change from developed
Developed an overall timeline for the program review – add
Multiple drafts, gathered feedback, into the product of 12.1 drafts
Communication – college
Trained self evaluation committee sec co-chairs – designed, conducted, and developed materials for co-chairs (4) training sessions

Talk about developing form to make a report – can we add to agenda?

Co-chair committees (ISIT, program review) – Action: kate will send notes to the last meeting. Need to develop a form to get feedback once a semester.

How are incorporating accreditation to your committee?

Suggest to give a newsletter - library newsletter and assessment blog – currently. Perhaps twice a year –newsletter.

SEC update
Becky met in Collins listened to reports and some discussed what has been organized. One of the faculty co-chairs resigned John Gerhold. Working on finding a replacement. Mark Staller will be the replacement and he will have to be trained.

Committee membership and calendar:
To be appointmented: list
The proposed meetings – are listed same time, same time.

Action: Vickie to schedule levinson 40 with Tarina.

April or may – training for fall teams (sept 7) – need to get it done in June.

Action: Contact SGA to recruit someone

Action: Kate to add Joyce Ester to list

Change email address for Ann Morgan

The senate has approved all the faculty and they would like to return next year.

Be part of IV A. or IV B. – community members (ad hoc) committee members.

Processes selecting the editor will need to be added: something to think about

Job description- editor (layout, margins) – will need to be worked on – note.

Discussion regarding sending out a survey regarding various sub-committees – Joyce Ester (survey monkey) in the fall joyce to help.

Action: Joyce Ester to send out a note to John means regarding licensing/security questions regarding survey monkey.

Accreditation memo – student planner meeting in student board room accreditation 101 for student Q&A has been planned – becky reported – names of SGA group

August flex workshops – Todd is planning

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Approved Minutes
August 23, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Renee Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey, Sue Granger-Dickson and Billy Barnes

Absentees: Bonnie Suderman, Klint Rigby, and Bernadette Towns

1. Review and approve May 10, 2011 minutes

- Minutes submitted to Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg.

2. Report on action items from May 10, 2011 meeting
- No action items to review from previous meeting.

3. Review committee charges for both ASC and SEC

The following are notes linked to the bulleted points on the ASC charge:
- Kate stated that ASC is on target for making accreditation an ongoing process.
- As for the development and integration processes for ongoing data collection (listed on the charge), concern about how and if this process is being completed. There is a place, however, in SharePoint to store the evidence and maintain leadership over the data collection. As the data comes in, need to show proof of any claims the Self Evaluation makes. Question about whose office would be the "hub" of information. It was Vickie Turney then Candice Sifuentes. Now with SharePoint, all information can be loaded to this one site where all would have access to the documentation.
- Sue stated that the assessment piece of this is missing when a representative is not present as these meetings. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg and Hamid Eydgahi both felt that the assessment referral on the charge was directed towards assessing the data that is gathered, rather than the assessment process in general.
- Kate stated that we need to stay on task for the processes for the data collection. Link actions to specific goals? Kate felt it was referencing the college goals which will be finalized at the next College Council meeting. They go to the Senate in September. Hamid stated that the group should clarify the college goals.
- The group is not sure who is in charge of the changes to the committee charges done online. There should be a checks& balance for the information that is posted online. What is the formal process? Need to get clarity on this. Kate will check with the Senate.
- Kate covered the rest of the charge to make sure that the ASC is on schedule with some questions on the matrix process. Kate asked Ann Morgan to follow up on her notes about the matrix.
- Co-chairs, Greg & Corny along with Kate are developing a form for all the committees to report to the college community on all the work they are doing to

prevent committees from duplicating the work. This would be an overview done three times a year, the first would focus on college goals, then the second would be a midyear update, and the third would be a wrap of what was done and what will need to be done next year. This would be on one of the channels on "Inside BC" like the student clubs are posted. Bill Moseley is working on this.

- Are we accountable for our time? If you are volunteering for this process, you need to make sure that you are participating on that committee. ASC needs to track who is doing what. There should be a list of expectations of what is needed from each committee members.
- ASC has to keep the accreditation process progressing. Renee suggested that we have liaison from ASC to make sure each area is being worked on.
- Kirk wanted to know if the SEC sub-committees are meeting and Kate responded, twice a month.
- LaMont Schiers asked could the co-chairs meeting time be adjusted? Becky Mooney stated that they are alternated throughout the month.

Kate went over the SEC charge handout.
- Research is the big part. Is the evidence there to support the work stated? Documentation is not consistent in the public folders.
- Renee wanted to know will Becky Mooney be able to cover all the charges when they meet with the SEC group.
- SEC has not met all summer, so the first meeting will not produce definite responses. College Council had a mini-retreat this summer to discuss the 14 recommendations. SEC is behind on this process.
- Kate went over the SEC Subcommittees and College Standing Committees also on the handout to determine who is covering each section. Renee thinks that adding more responsibility to the co-chairs at this point is unnecessary and Kate agreed.

Kate went over the dates on the timeline handout (Updated version done in January 2011). Kate discussed due dates and where ASC stood at this time.

4. Standing Governance Committee Co-chairs update
Nan gave an update on committees activities. Kate stated that most of the standing governance committees were represented at the retreat.

5. Annual Program Review- Update
Kate stated there was a 20-person group that worked over the summer to translate the approved proposal to fill-in forms. Ann Morgan is finalizing the forms and making sure that they have the correct links. Billy Barnes and Stephen Eaton, PRC co-chairs, are assisting Ann Morgan in this process. They will have something prepared to present to FCDC Friday, August 26th at the meeting.

6. SEC Update
Becky Mooney went over the SEC handout that was a report of activities over the summer. Amber Chiang will be writing the beginning of the BC story. There is a new template for SEC report that has been uploaded to SharePoint for all teams to

document on. Becky Mooney has been in touch with Greg Chamberlain, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, and Jane Harmon at the District about the uniformity of the reports being done and use of the template. Becky Mooney and Bonnie Suderman gathered information on the progress of the 14 recommendations and will be meeting Friday, August 26th, to discuss rubrics will all the co-chairs as well information needed for the upcoming Board report.

7. SharePoint update-
a. ASC has access: https://spt.kccd.edu/bc-accreditation/

This is where the accreditation information is being stored. Anyone trying to access and edit the information has to do so through Internet Explorer or Foxfire. All information needed for the SEC about the 14 recommendations has been uploaded. There is a "check-in & check-out" when using the documents in SharePoint; documents cannot be in use by more than one person at a time. This is a safety feature to prevent people making changes at the same time. The group is impressed with the way Todd Coston has designed the SharePoint site.

Discussed how the folders should be accessed when the survey team arrives and setting up sub folders can be helpful when accessing the documents by section. Numbering these sub folders will also make tracking the data easier and during the documentation stages as well as the final process.

Action: Make ASC available on SharePoint. Kirk will work with Todd Coston.

8. Focus group update

Kimberly held a very informative training workshop on how the focus groups should be conducted. Becky Mooney stated that all groups need to be asked the same questions on the same topic, that way the feedback that is given will truly reflect the data that is being collected. The questioning should also be brief.

9. Survey status update

This was briefly touched on and notes from Bonnie are on the agenda:

Notes from Bonnie: Questions need to be in to me by the third week in September. They need to tell me:

1. What info are they trying to find by the question, and
2. A draft of the question.

If we have any concerns we will contact them to clarify.

The survey will be sent out Sept 30

They will have 1 week to complete

The due date is Oct 6th

We will supply them with the resulting data. If they ask open ended questions, we will just supply the raw data and let them look for themes.

10. Survey status update

Reminder: that BOT report is due to the District by noon on September 12th.
Discussion on BOT report preparation. Need to discuss at the August 30th meeting. Is ASC including the quarterly reports in the annual report? Nan stated the need for a sub group. Sue offered to work on combining the data from 2nd & 3rd quarterly reports tomorrow. This will be part of the master document for the BOT meeting. Becky Mooney showed concern for the lack of email response by the members who are

working on their part of the 14 recommendations. Nan stated that the report should include establishment of the budget committee as well. Kirk suggested that the SharePoint also should be included in the report.

Meeting adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Next Meeting: **Tuesday, August 30, 2011**
                   3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Collins Conference Center

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Approved Minutes
August 30, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Renee Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey, Sue Granger-Dickson, Bernadette Towns, Bonnie Suderman and Billy Barnes

Absentees: Klint Rigby, SGA

1. Review and approve August 23, 2011 minutes

- Minutes were emailed to Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg and Kate Pluta.

2. Report on action items from August 23, 2011 meeting
- Kirk moved all the Public ASC documents to the Share Points. They are accessible now in one place along with the other committee documents.
- Sue Granger-Dickson completed combining the quarterly documents.

3. SEC Update – need handout?

4. Reminder: BOT accreditation report due to district by noon on September 12th.
Kate Pluta asked that the group review the last three quarterly reports from 2010-2011 and the ACCJC rubrics sent Monday the 29th of August and also to discuss what all should be included. Rebecca Mooney was not sure that the author's of the summaries knew others would see the documents in the quarterly reports. Kate Pluta suggested given access to the BOT to SharePoint but some of the group didn't think the BOT would search through the data on the site. Rachel Vickery felt it was a good reference source as well as the previous accreditation visit in 2006. College Council may have those notes.

5. Self Evaluation editor
Kate Pluta and Becky Mooney meet with Greg Chamberlain on August 29th and discussed the position requirements, selection process and compensation for the Self Evaluation editor. (*Please see August 30th agenda for details*) Greg Chamberlain would like for all involved in the process to be there from start to finish and completed by May. It was decided that the February 7th date for the editor to present to ASC would work best to meet the timeline for an April submission to the district. The question was posed if the editor would be able to attend the ASC meeting and Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg stated that there was no pay for that. Kate Pluta asked ASC if they needed the editor to have a certain skill, to direct those questions to her.
 Action: Office of Academic Affairs to confirm the survey team arrival date to BC.

6. Survey status update- Joyce and Bonnie
(*Please see August 30th agenda for details*). The survey will be sent out on September 30th and they will have one week to complete with an October 6th due date.

7. Student members

8. Subgroup for Integrated Program Review volunteers?

9. Problem-solving request
Ann Morgan would like to have ASC to decide the best way to evaluate the planning processes after the Accreditation focus since its part of the first Recommendation.

Adjourned- Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 13, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Levinson 40

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
September 13, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Rachel Vickrey, D. Romo (SGA) , Ann Morgan, Sue Granger-Dickson, Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), and Diana Kelly.

Absentees: Klint Rigby, Bernadette Towns, Bonnie Suderman, Billy Barnes Renee Trujillo.

1. **Review and approve minutes from August 30, 2011 meeting**
    Minutes were sent to Kate Pluta and Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg for review and approval.

2. Report on action items
    Tabled for this meeting per Kate Pluta.
3. SEC Update
    Most did not attend the SEC meeting. Possible reschedule to Fridays if continued low attendance. SEC report due September 23rd. Bonnie Suderman and Rebecca Mooney will have this completed. Rebecca had the group agree to a report once a month. Diana Kelly stated that the link to SharePoint was incorrect. **Note: Correction needed on link on minutes has been corrected.** Ann Morgan didn't see the need for printing info with SharePoint. At the SEC meeting, accreditation reference page 18 in section 2A- Stephen Eaton noted that verbiage needs to be change on "computer literacy". Rebecca informed them that is a curriculum issue. Others noted several errors in BC catalog and student handbook. Bonnie Suderman is working with Dave Barnett at DO to fix placement of the handbook on the BC website. Dan O'Connor needs additional help with Recommendation 4A. Rebecca will attend the next SGA board meeting.

4. BOT accreditation report
    The Board of Trustees (BOT) accreditation report was submitted on time. Adjustments made to Rubrics and condensed. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg went over what was included in the report. The report gave a snapshot of where the ASC is in the process for Accreditation. Report will be posted electronically to be posted in SharePoint.

5. Self Evaluation editor- (job description previously emailed)
    Questions: Can it be a part-time faculty member? If at .06, then there could be a problem with compensation. When would they get reassign time? December 6th through February is the time frame the editor will be working, but Rachel Vickery feels that most work will be done up to the end of the accreditation period(Summer of 2012). Full semester work will be done in a short period of time. Questions arose about the completion date of the editor? Are they getting paid for work time that they might not be doing? Rebecca Mooney suggested a bullet on the job description stating editor will be available for changes as needed throughout the semester. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg wanted to know how would the editor show qualifications; resume? Kate Pluta went over the entire job description for feedback from ASC. *(See handout for detailed report)*

6. Survey status update
    Joyce Ester stated the survey would go out to students, faculty and staff. Joyce suggested that the survey be brief to hold the attention for those completing it. The survey will be sent out September 30th; one week to complete; due date is October 6th. Bonnie Suderman & Joyce Ester will supply them with raw data for the open ended questions.

7. Student Member
    SGA is in the process of interviewing for senators. No students are available during our meeting time; it conflicts with their SGA meetings Joyce Ester pointed out that some committees do not

want students on the committees. Sue Granger- Dickson asked Kate Pluta about student participation in the past for the accreditation process. Kate will further investigate this.

8. Volunteers- for subgroup to work on Integrated Program Review proposal
      Kate asked for volunteers for a subgroup to work on the Integrated Program Review proposal. Kate stated not ready to move forward. The subgroup should include a representative from each study so they are represented in the proposal.

9. **Problem solving request:** *See agenda for suggestions by Ann Morgan*
      Kate Pluta stated this will be kept on agenda

10. Collegewide Committee Report
      This report will review goals from past (See handout). Will be finished next week to go to College Council and Academic Senate.

Adjourned- Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 20, 2011
                            3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
                              Levinson 40

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
October 4, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Becky Mooney (co-chair), Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, Rachel Vickrey, Denise Romo (SGA) , Ann Morgan, Sue Granger-Dickson, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), and Bonnie Suderman.

Absentees: Klint Rigby, Bernadette Towns, Billy Barnes Renee Trujillo, Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, LaMont Schiers, and Diana Kelly .

1. **Review and approve minutes- pending**

2. **Report on action items**
    Collegewide Committee Reports are being worked on. Debbie Spohn will re-title and post. Survey and focus groups updates; questions are due Thursday to Bonnie Suderman stating what information they need.

    Action: Send electronic version of Accreditation report to BOT.

3. **SEC Update**
    Rebecca Mooney suggested that those who are responsible for their recommendations need to report on them. Rebecca gave handouts sighting the report on findings for recommendations and group reports on progress. Noted was missing information on some of the recommendations. Kate Pluta shared that being on the side of gathering data, not everything is regulated. Kate paused to introduce and welcome our SGA representative, Denise Romo, a SGA senator to the committee. Joyce Ester questioned how should the responses be formatted when covering the recommendations? General answers or narrative? Kirk Russell had a formatting question about how the responses to the sub-standards are posted. They are currently grouped but should be separated out. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg suggested to make the responses to the sub-standards is segmented out. **(See handout for more detailed information)**

4. **Integrated Program Review**
    Sue Granger- Dickson stated they have not met yet, so no report at this time.

5. **Planning**
    Integrated Collegewide Planning is on the agendas for both Academic Senate (Wednesday) and College Council (Friday). Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg felt that ASC are proactively operating in a scarce to limited resource environment per the chart where as Sue felt that we were more reactive in the same environment and needing to be in the adequate to ample resource environment. **(See handout #2 Organizational research and planning assessment)** Sue also passed out a third handout out that gave a little insight to two key factors that define a college's relationship to planning, budgeting and evaluation. **(See handout #3 Planning, Organizational Culture and Resources in CCC)**. Dr. Ester stated that the chart doesn't show a complete picture of where ASC is at in this process. What data determines ASC placement in proactive vs. reactive? Rachel Vickery said transparency is the key. Bonnie Suderman stated that being reactive is not necessarily a bad thing. We can use it to our advantage. Sue Granger-Dickson suggested that we need to have a one-page description or what our integrated college planning, that could go to everyone so we know what questions are being addressed at other meetings. **(Please see Renee Trujillo's' notes on the agenda)**. Comments were also made about committees needing to do more on the evaluation process on a consistent basis.

6. **Communication from ACCJC**
    Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi- Unit District or Systems (rev. June 2011) Discuss from previous meeting.

Adjourned- Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 11, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Levinson 40

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
October 11, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Rachel Vickrey, D. Romo(SGA)

Absentees: Klint Rigby, Ann Morgan, Sue Granger-Dickson, Bernadette Towns, Bonnie Suderman, Billy Barnes Renee Trujillo, Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), and Diana Kelly.

1. Review and approve minutes - pending

2. Report on action items
- Jennifer Marden posted to SharePoint the College wide Committee Reports and broke down the tables
- Self Evaluation Editor has been named. Jennifer Jett, who is faculty from the English department who serve in the new position. (
- Survey will be ready by 5pm per Bonnie Suderman. Earlier there was a server issue that has now been resolved.

3. SEC Update
The question was asked that since planning agendas are already addressed in the midterm report; do committees need to still address them? Yes, per Kate Pluta and Rachel Vickery. LaMont Schiers said that the SEC is reviewing the entire document. Kirk Russell asked when the ASC will have time to write the actionable Improvement Plan. December 6th is when they will go to the editor. Kate Pluta suggested cleaning up the evidence that does not go into the main documents and use as supplemental evidence and have available to the survey team just in case they ask for more documentation. The suggestion was also made that all finished documents be in PDF. LaMont asked how the survey team will be able to access the supplemental evidence. Group will give it some thought. *(See Report to Accreditation Steering Committee handout for details)*

4. Integrated Program Review
A subgroup report given by Diana Kelly, Sue Granger-Dickson, Klint Rigby and Billy Barnes. No report at this time.

5. Planning – report from Academic Senate, College Council and Budget Committee
Per Kate Pluta the ASC is asking the Academic Senate, College Council, and the Budgeting Committee to discuss our college's planning process. Is our college planning integrated? Do we evaluate it? Senators discussed whether the BC planning process is reactive or proactive, or as some suggested, reactive to a problem, but then proactive later on in addressing the causes of the problem.
College Council also discussed reactive and proactive planning stated that both are needed. Plan as much as possible, but also be able to respond to unexpected threat and opportunities.
Budget Committee on the 10th of October discussed the links to committee goals 2, 6, and 7; focusing on establishing a timeline which allows for timely college review, input, modification and clear articulation processes for reviewing budget requests.
(See handout for detailed report)

6. Accreditation Liaison Officer training report
No report at this time. EVP will report by email or at next meeting.

7. Communication from ACCJC

At previous meeting, handout has given to ASC with the policies and procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems that was revised June 2011. Kirk Russell stated he had been reading through and covering how the process works.

8. Update on Program Review implementation

Hamid gave some feedback about program review documents coming into the Office of Academic Affairs. They were do last Friday. Most were submitted. Not sure if they will go to SharePoint. Ann Morgan will probably be able to discuss when she and Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg return from the Student Success Conference next week.

Adjourned- Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 25, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Levinson 40