

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Regular Meeting

March 7, 2008 (9:00 AM – 11:00 AM)

Ethan Way Center 205

❧ NOTES ❧

1 9:00 AM Call to Order

Present: Tony Barcellos, Betty Glycer-Culver, Kelly Irwin, Gordon Lam, Anne Licciardi, Sue Lorimer, Kathy McLain, Nelle Moffett, Kathie Read, Susie Williams, Bill Karns, Jane de Leon

2 Approval of the Agenda The agenda was approved by consensus with one addition: item “j” was amended at Jane’s request to read “From the Colleges: Lessons Learned / Emerging Issues.”

3 Approval of the Notes for 1 February 2007 The notes were approved by consensus.

4 Updates and Discussion

a) Request to the managers for drafts of the descriptions, analysis/self-evaluation, and planning agenda

Bill reported that he had sent to the managers the request to draft the information; the request included sample excerpts. At the meeting of the District Managers on Monday, 10 March, he will discuss the drafts again. The deadline for the managers to submit their drafts is 17 March.

For drafts describing functions that come under the purview of shared governance committees, the following schedule was suggested:

Document and Responsible Party or (Parties)	Action	Date
First draft by managers	Send to appropriate shared governance group for review; <i>Nota bene:</i> in the interest of supporting the work schedules of the college accreditation steering committees, it is suggested that the shared governance groups complete their reviews electronically rather than waiting for their next regular meetings	17 March
First draft reviewed by shared governance groups	Return reviewed first draft with comments, if any, for consideration by managers	31 March
Revised drafts by managers	Forward to Bill & Jane for transmittal to the colleges' accreditation co-chairs	2 April

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 7 March 2008 (9:00 – 11:00 AM)

b) Mapping document (draft 2)

Bill sent this document (complete designation: "draft 2, version 5") for review by the college presidents, Chancellor's executive staff, members of this committee, and the District Academic Senate.

This committee welcomes feedback from all of the constituencies. For ease in recording the feedback, the committee suggests that an additional column be inserted to the right of the pertinent standard or portion of the standard.

So that this committee might have the feedback for consideration at its monthly meeting on 4 April, the suggested deadlines for receiving all comments are 31 March from the colleges and, in recognition that the District Academic Senate's next meeting does not occur until 1 April, the deadline for the District Academic Senate is 2 April.

c) Scheduling the standards chairs' discussion with the District reps

Deferring to Folsom Lake College's work schedule, the committee agreed that the week of 21 April would be the optimal time for scheduling the meeting between the managers and the accreditation standards chairs. Two additional suggestions:

- Accreditation standards chairs or designees would benefit from this opportunity for requesting information from the District managers
- The invitation memo from Bill and Jane should include the suggestion that because minutes for each information session should be recorded and then posted on the District's accreditation Web site, one of the representatives will be asked to be the official note taker

d) Setting up the District's accreditation Web site

Discussion ensued about the difference between the District's Accreditation Web page and the Web page referred to in the District Academic Senate's review and findings in its 2006-2007 review of District-level shared governance groups. Jane explained that the first recommendation of that review completed in May 2007 recommends that a District Web page for shared governance committees be established; this Web page would contain links to all of the District's shared governance groups and to the pertinent documentation for their work: e.g., the agenda, meeting notes, and other supporting information. She also suggested that although both the District Accreditation Web page and the shared governance Web page would link to similar material, the functions of the two pages are different: the Accreditation Web page supports the accreditation preparation efforts and is period-specific, i.e., dedicated to the accreditation cycle; in contrast, shared governance is ongoing -- and likewise for the shared governance Web page.

Susie, Betty, and Jane agreed to schedule a meeting for setting up the shared governance Web page.

e) Question raised last December: what is public, and what is private?

Having posed this concern at a previous meeting in the fall, Anne started the discussion by asking, "Of all documents prepared for accreditation, which of those documents should not be publicly accessible? For documents that are not publicly accessible, what is the justification for the inaccessibility?"

Susie responded that in accord with the Public Information Act, 98 percent of what we do is public; two examples of exceptions are personnel matters and student data. Of the 98 percent that is public, how the information is made public is left to the District's discretion, and this

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 7 March 2008 (9:00 – 11:00 AM)

discretion is shaped by two questions: 1) what was the original purpose in compiling the information and 2) would disclosing the information on the Internet damage the original purpose? She gave the following examples: if data were being compiled for program improvement, participation in compiling the data might be negatively affected if the data made available to the public were taken out of context; also, from the point of view of proprietary issues, how could we prevent information available on the Internet from being used by competing private institutions?

Kathy observed that this question has implications for the standard on conveying quality assurance information to the public [Jane's note: an example of a standard referred to by Kathy is Standard I.B.5].

The question was asked: are all of the colleges able to post information that is only internal? The responses were:

- ARC uses password-protected portals
- CRC has no way of posting information that is only internal
- FLC has no way of posting information that is only internal
- SCC research uses password-protected accounts to post private information in the "public folders" so that these folders are receptacles for internal information only.

The consensus of this committee concerning, "what is *public* and what is *private*?":

- 1 Each college will make its own decision about what to link for general public consumption**
- 2 At the end of this accreditation cycle, this topic should be addressed in this committee's final report**
- 3 This topic should be included as a standard topic on all future agenda.**

f) Questions raised last February: how might "non players" be encouraged to participate? Within normal processes, what other structures encourage larger participation?

- FLC: to encourage adjuncts to participate, Gordon met with adjuncts and encouraged their participation from the perspective of their being experts in their disciplines
- Betty suggested that lessons on encouraging greater participation can also be drawn from the recently-completed employee satisfaction survey

To the question, "How are students being involved?" these answers were shared:

- ARC: officers of the Student Associate (SA) are serving on the steering committee; ARC also asked, "How are we getting students' attention?"
- FLC: the president of the student association and other student reps sit on every standards group; Gordon's information programs are televised monthly; Sue has visited the student government class and emphasized that the effort of seeking out students to recruit their participation must be ongoing and renewed each semester, with special effort made to set up separate (i.e., times different from regular standards meetings) for the students' convenience
- CRC: "going to the students" takes the form of identifying existing student groups (e.g., Student Ambassadors, leadership classes, Puente, gatherings in the student center) and meeting with them in their places to establish dialogue.

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Notes for the Meeting on 7 March 2008 (9:00 – 11:00 AM)

- SCC: effort has been made to revise meeting times for the standards committees to accommodate the students' schedules; caveat: even this accommodation, however, has not resulted in the students' attending the meetings). I-mail offers another option for communicating with students.

g) Software for recording data for SLOs assessment This item will be included in the next agenda.

h) Calendar: working back from the deadline to the Board

Bill announced that the completed drafts of the self-studies will go to the Board of Trustees for their signatures at the June 2009 meeting, and he suggested that creating a comprehensive schedule working back from that ultimate deadline would be helpful. The colleges were asked to share their schedules at the next meeting so that the comprehensive composite of all four colleges could be compiled.

i) From the Colleges: Lessons learned / Emerging Issues

- ARC: Bill commended the college for its "red curtain" theme for announcing accreditation at the January convocation. Kathy reported that training for all members of the accreditation teams will occur on 4 April; the training schedule will include: the ACCJC's *PowerPoint* presentation for a general overview, Marie Smith's discussing strategies and tips for writing, workshops conducted by participants in the recent Accreditation Institute, breakouts for the standards chairs and their team.
- CRC: all standards committees and subcommittees for the standards have met; training is occurring today and includes the ACCJC *PowerPoint* and an edited self-study that participants are using as a case study for evaluating effective and less effective work responding to the accreditation standards
- FLC: the first of three in-progress reviews have been received; the steering committee is meeting with the standards co-chairs to discuss further the progress reports; the steering committee has received feedback on the employee accreditation survey and the student accreditation survey. Also, FLC announced that in fall 2008 and spring 2008, FLC's writer/editor for the self study will be allocated 0.2 reassigned time from FLC's 0.6 allocation; the individual standards chairs are not receiving reassigned time because they are preparing information in bullet-point format that the writer will use.
- SCC: initial training of the tri-chairs and team leaders has been completed; SCC will have an editor, and this individual will receive compensation for his or her services.

It was noted that both ARC and FLC are using the same approach to writing the self-study: the standards chairs are preparing the information in bulleted format, with bulleted information introduced by an overview or brief narrative. FLC was asked to share its template for this work and agreed to send this template to Bill and Jane for distribution to the members of the District Accreditation Coordinating Committee.

j) Future agenda items

Members of the committee agreed to forward their items to Bill and Jane.

5 Announcements

Meeting dates in this semester: 4 April, and 2 May, 9:00-11:00 AM in 205 EWC

6 Adjournment

occurred at 10:55 AM.