



Accreditation Steering Committee
February 14, 2008 Minutes

APPROVED 4/10/08

MEETING TYPE:	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Staff Product/Project Special	Date: 2/14/2008 Starting Time: 2:30 p.m. Ending Time: 3:50 p.m. Place: AA-140
----------------------	---	--	--

CHAIR: Berta Cuaron, ALO

ATTENDANCE: Michelle Barton, Norma Bean, Brent Gowen, Terry Gray, Shawna Hearn, Ken Jay, Mike Large, Teresa Laughlin, Tom Medel, Linda Morrow, Mary San Agustin, Diane Veach

ABSENT: Monika Brannick, Bruce Gan, Katherine Gannett, Neill Kovrig, Jesse Lyn, Kelley Hudson Maclsaac, Jackie Martin-Klement, Tamara Weintraub

RECORDER: Joan Decker

Chair Berta Cuaron called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Minutes: The January 16, 2008, minutes were approved as presented.

Timeline and Additional Components of Self-Study: Berta noted that the timeline and additional components were reviewed at the last meeting and that we need to make plans and define working groups to continue working on the self study and on the special components during the summer. We recognize faculty are off-contract during the summer months, but that there is compensation available for a willingness to commit time during the summer. She asked that as everyone makes their summer vacation plans that they also consider committing some time during the summer. Berta and Glynda can then further define what the working groups will look like so we can begin work on the special components and continue writing, editing, and collecting evidence.

Status/Progress of Writing Teams: Berta said draft #1 is starting to come in and advised that it is ok if teams need to wait until next week to submit their drafts but recommends that drafts be submitted as soon as possible. Teams were advised to send drafts to Glynda and she will post them on the sharepoint. Berta said that she is aware that teams are at various stages in preparing their draft and asked them to let her or one of the Co-Chairs know if they would like assistance completing the first draft. Berta explained that she and the Co-Chairs will (1) Read the first drafts while focusing on separate standards, (2) Re-read each draft at another level, and (3) Meet to discuss and develop a collective summary of questions and feedback to provide to

the writing team leaders. This information should be available in the next 2 to 3 weeks. Berta recommended that to avoid confusion, teams should wait for the feedback before continuing with further editing. Michelle and Tom said teams could use the 3 weeks to incorporate the employee survey results. Brent reminded that we are too early in the writing process to be concerned with refining the document to make its voice and style uniform. Tom said we should let others such as the Facilities Review Committee review the document. Mary said the Student Services Committee has reviewed its draft document. Berta recognized that teams have been working incredibly hard on their drafts and agreed that eventually we could look to other groups for their expertise to help strengthen the self-study.

Mary expressed concern that the self study should have a system to consistently cite documents and web evidence especially for standards that overlap and asked for help on how to cross-reference. Berta reminded everyone that evidence for overlapping standards needs to be repeated throughout the self-study so it will be available for reviewers assigned to separate standards. Michelle discussed the need to develop a cataloging process for the evidence but suggested a table to list evidence with web links at the end of each standard and substandard to make reading and referencing easy for the site team reviewers. Ken indicated that team members from Fiscal Services will be busy this spring with the budget cuts and construction bids and will have limited time to do multiple rewrites.

Employee Survey Update: Michelle Barton introduced and welcomed new Research Analyst, Mike Large, to the Steering Committee. Mike presented a draft analysis of the employee survey which he developed and administered. Mike thanked everyone for their help and feedback in developing the questionnaire and noted that we received a better than expected response rate. The analysis includes demographic questions and results by standard and recognized that results for all standards are positive. The report includes an analysis by classification, length of employment, and participants in the governing process. Appendices include a frequency distribution by question and open-ended comments. Michelle and Mike emphasized that confidentiality of respondents was maintained throughout the process and if necessary, was masked in the comments. He reminded reviewers to take care in interpreting comments as only 110 of the 514 respondents provided comments and blank lines between the comments represent when no comments were made. Michelle said we need to be self-reflective and cautious in interpreting comments which seem to mix governance issues with current negotiation issues and that the number of responses may not be fully representative of the larger population. She said since this survey did not ask respondents to list 3 things you like or list 3 areas where we could improve, she could offer to accreditation teams the recent results from planning council self-evaluations where we've asked these questions. Mike said that this group's comments and edits will be added to this draft. The analysis will be posted on the accreditation website and will also be sent to all accreditation writing teams. Mike can be contacted with any additional questions on the survey or if you would like him to review results with your group.

Other: Berta will send to the committee all of the documents that Teresa brought from a recent conference. Berta reported that she attended a WASC workshop last week. ACCJC/WASC is under continued scrutiny from the U.S. Department of Education and we are beginning to see the impact of the pressure they are feeling. In January, ACCJC/WASC took action on 9 California community colleges and placed them either on warning, extended some warnings and moved some to probation status. It is being held to the standards dictated to them by the U.S. Department of Education. Palomar's re-accreditation will be in that cycle, and the message at last week's workshop was that they are no longer sugar coating recommendations and no longer deferring to giving more time for improvements and discussions. As is apparent with its Accreditation Steering Committee – February 14, 2008 Minutes

January actions, we are in a challenging review cycle where the ACCJC/WASC has to answer to the US Department of Education. Mary said the Higher Education act is still not passed and there has been no reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in ten years. Institutions are being pressured to be more accountable and all offices will be faced with more reporting and more scrutiny. Berta said it's important that our self study not only share the great things we are doing, and great people who are working hard but also candidly address the difficult challenges and issues that we are dealing with and recommend areas of concern that need to be improved.

Berta thanked the committee for its time commitment to this tremendous task and critical work.

The next ASC meeting is Thursday, March 13, 2:30 – 3:50 p.m., in AA-140. The meeting times will remain the second Thursdays of April and May from 2:30 – 3:50 p.m., in AA-140.

Reminder: Writing team leaders should notify Glynda of changes to the writing teams so she can update the Web and SharePoint sites. Faculty working off-contract hours should report their hours to their team leaders or directly to Glynda.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Next Meeting:
Thursday, ~~March 13, 2008~~ - April 10, 2008
2:30 – 3:50 pm
AA-140