

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting

February 1, 2008 (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)

Ethan Way Center 205

AGENDA

1 9:00 AM Call to Order & Introductions

Present: Barcellos (ARC), Chenu-Campbell (SCC), Glycer-Culver (Institutional Research, District), Lam (FLC), Licciardi (SCC), Lorimer (FLC), McLain (CRC), Read (ARC), Wellsfry (CRC), Williams (Chancellor's Office), de Leon, Karns.

2 Approval of the Agenda with these changes: a) added "two-year rule" as the first item under discussion and b) corrected the March meeting date from March 1 to March 7

3 Approval of the Notes for December 7, 2007: by consensus

4 Discussion

Added item:

Two-year rule: Nory informed the committee that ACCJC President Barbara Beno communicated to CEOs that the ACCJC is now enforcing the two-year rule, i.e., colleges that have received sanctions and not brought themselves into compliance will be terminated if the two-year deadline is not met.

a) Update on the request to the managers for drafts of the descriptions, analysis/self-evaluation, and planning agenda:

- Colleges' responses to request for revisions or additions to the third, fourth columns: Bill noted the changes suggested by the colleges.

Bill will now start the tasking process, possibly setting up a deadline of 15 February so that the information will be ready for the meeting on 7 March.

Also, Jane will ask the District Academic Senate to write the description / evaluation / planning agenda" for the review of shared governance committees in Standard 4.

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 1 February 2008 (9:00 – 11:00 AM)

- Cross-referencing evidence from previous studies to the new standards and Los Rios language:

Kathy McLain shared the document she had drafted for CRC's use. It is intended to inform the getting-ready process, including the reminder to consider how to do business so that evidence of dialogue is compiled and accessible.

b) Update on mapping (draft): refining the text of the rubric

Bill began the discussion by asking, "What needs to be done to move this document forward? Is this document ready for comment?" The following discussion ensued:

- ◆ The definition of, "shared" might be too limited. However, increasing gradations might result in diminishing returns.
- ◆ The function of mapping is to show both, "who does what" and "does everyone understand who is responsible"
- ◆ The question marks on the draft were removed
- ◆ The terms, *mutual responsibility and interdependence* should be included to "SH" on the front page.

c) Scheduling the standards chairs' discussion with the District reps: the time for these meetings should support the writing process

All agreed that two meetings should be scheduled:

- Meeting 1: Standards chairs receive a briefing from District reps on their various functions, perhaps in the spring
- Meeting 2: Standards chairs dialogue with District reps, perhaps in the fall and perhaps organized around standards

d) Setting up the District's accreditation Website: updates concerning posting

Susie stated that the accreditation Website is being posted beginning this year.

- Program review data : in progress, and Bill is working on a document to link DO program review to budget allocations
- Meeting dates and agenda for Board of Trustees: deferred until we receive input from the Chancellor
- Coordination & storage of information: District assistance for software to assist colleges in maintaining course SLO assessment data at the department level: Bill asked for the names of the software programs that were described at the Accreditation Institute so that he and Mick Holsclaw can discuss and research; discussion of this software should include the SLO coordinators. Kathie Read reported that ARC is using *Class Climate*.

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 1 February 2008 (9:00 – 11:00 AM)

- e) Question raised last December: what is public, and what is private? This item will be included in the next agenda.
- f) Lessons learned, to date:

At the Accreditation Institute (25-27 January)

- ♦ Tony Barcellos: concerning the standards vs. themes discussion, the standards should be addressed and documented; the themes should not be ignored and, perhaps, could be included as part of the executive summary and overview
- ♦ Gordon Lam: Accreditation and SLOs were the two themes around which the breakouts were organized. Emphasized: the importance of the faculty's understanding the rubric.

Sue Lorimer commented on the importance of administratively creating an environment that will allow faculty to accomplish its work.

Susie Williams asked what might be done to better communicate the rubric to faculty, and Sue suggested this communication should occur through governance and operational groups and faculty leaders.

- ♦ Norv Wellsfry: the value of SLOs is receiving increased recognition; also occurring is a shift to recognizing the value of accreditation as a help to the colleges for improving what they do.
- ♦ Jane de Leon: presenters discussed the value of being well-along in the development of institutional-level SLOs. Norv emphasized the importance of a timeline for working on institutional-level SLOs.

At the colleges working through their accreditation preparation process

Suggested as a future agenda item: consider the question of how to encourage participation of “nonplayers”; within normal processes, what other structures encourage larger participation?

5 Announcements:

Meeting Dates in this semester: 7 March [corrected], 4 April, and 2 May
[all scheduled at 9:00-11:00 AM in 205 EWC]

6 Adjournment at 11:05 AM.