



Accreditation Steering Committee
Special Meeting
September 5, 2008 Minutes

TO BE APPROVED

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------|
| MEETING TYPE: | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff | Date: | 9/5/2008 |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Product/Project | Starting Time: | 9:00 a.m. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Special | Ending Time: | 12:00 p.m. |
| | | Place: | B-6 |

- CHAIR:** Berta Cuaron, ALO
- ATTENDANCE:** Michelle Barton, Norma Bean, Monika Brannick, Candi Francis for Mollie Smith, Katherine Gannett, Shawna Hearn, Kelley Hudson Maclsaac, Ken Jay, Shannon Lienhart, Tom Medel, Linda Morrow, Mary SanAgustin, Javier Tovar for Rob Frederick
- ABSENT:** Bruce Gan, Brent Gowen, Terry Gray, Jackie Martin-Klement, Diane Veach
- RECORDER:** Glynda Knighten

Chair Berta Cuaron called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes: Approval of the minutes of the August 4 – 7 was postponed until the September 11 meeting.

Review/Respond to Standards: The committee reviewed and responded to Draft # 5 of Standard III.D (Financial Resources) and Standard IV.A (Decision-Making Roles & Processes). Review of and response to Standard II.A (Instructional Programs) was postponed until the September 11 meeting.

Director of Institutional Research and Planning made the following comments:

I would like the minutes to reflect my following statement. I have reviewed Draft #5 of Standard IVA and I am concerned as evidence that was presented in earlier drafts that speaks to the effectiveness of the governance process at Palomar has been removed and what is left is an over-reliance on one source – the accreditation self-study survey. While I can go along with the plans described in the document, I do not agree with the evaluation that the college does not meet the standards. We have a significant amount of evidence that supports the notion that the college engages in participatory governance in ways specified by the standards. The following are examples

The operations of the current Policies and Procedures Task Force. This task force has been reviewing the college’s policies and procedures. The documents that govern everything we do at this institution. The process has been collegial and very participatory. For example, recently the policies and procedures task force approved several policies and administrative procedures. At a following meeting, the President of PFF as the task force the reconsider some of the administrative procedures already approved. The task force did reconsider and adjustments were made.

The educational and facilities master plan and all of the work going into the new facilities on this campus. This was an institution-wide initiative that went through several layers of our governance process. All of the work being done in this area is through a participatory process.

The current AIP. During review of the AIP report (2007-08) at last Tuesday's SPC meeting, the President of the PFF asked that we include a space holder for the 2008-09 AIP to begin work on the plans coming out of our accreditation self-study. This was done. Also, in recognition that we are not making progress on one of the objectives related to the full-time faculty hiring, the 75/25 group has been reconstituted. I believe this reflects a serious attempt on the institution's part to address this objective of our Strategic Plan.

The Strategic Plan . The strategic plan is a document that all staff have an opportunity to participate in developing. It is not developed by administration. It is developed again through the participatory governance process of this college.

The results of the Planning Councils' self-evaluations. If we are to include the 2008 accreditation self-study survey results and rely on perceptions as our only source of evidence, then we need to place these council self-evaluations right next to the 2008 survey results.

The number of individuals who participate in our governance process is an indirect measure of the effectiveness of the process (it looks at the input to the process)

I ask that the committee move forward to document the information described above in the college's response to this standard. Again, I am not dismissing what is currently described in the document. Rather, I am asking for us to take a more objective and balanced approach and not consider one issue as the only issue. This does nothing for the college or our students. From a measurement/research perspective, there is a process called triangulation which typically involves using more than one method to (i.e., at least three) to study, research or assess a phenomenon. There are different types of triangulation such as data triangulation or investigator triangulation. However, the purpose of triangulation in research (especially qualitative research) is to increase the credibility/validity of the results. At this point, it appears that we have not only relied on one method, we have relied on one event (the administration of one survey) to make our conclusions (complete our self evaluation). This is not good or sound use of evidence. As currently written, I can not support document.

Planning Agendas: The committee reviewed and responded to the 10 planning agendas. Berta noted that they are intended to be broad-based and institution-wide. Glynda will incorporate suggestions and distribute at the September 5 meeting.

Committee members voiced appreciation for Berta's leadership of the Self-Study. The development of the self-study has been a good example of shared governance. There has been college-wide opportunity for participation and input as the writing of the self-study has continued through its process.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

| |
|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Next Meeting: Thursday, September 11 2:00 – 3:30 p.m. AA-109</p> |
|---|