

## ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Members Present: Brown, Brooks, Ford,  
Gonzales, Johnson, Keller, McNeil, Morones,  
Nesta, Nette, Riley, Perri, Satele, Wangler

Members Absent: Joe Marron and Cristina

A regular meeting of the Cuyamaca College Accreditation Steering Committee was held on December 1, 2006 in Room F106.



### Agenda Item

### Discussion

#### *1. Approve Minutes*

Mike Wangler thanked Gene Morones, who will be retiring and Aaron Keller who will be transferring to a University for their participation on the committee.

Minutes were approved: M/S/A with 3 abstentions

#### *2. Feedback re Standard III & IV*

The purpose of this agenda item was to have an open discussion on critiquing of Standard III and IV. An interactive discussion ensued and general items were addressed.

Standard IV: There was a consensus among the group that this Standard was well written, easy to follow, reflective of a lot of work being done, and that the terminology addressed in the booklet "Guide to Evaluating Institutions" should be used more freely in this Standard. This is a good model for the other standards.

The section related to the District/Board

needs to be expanded. There was an effective description of the budget approval process which can be rolled into and used by Standard III to look at and coincide with Standard IV.

A question surfaced on how to include the college planning agenda when it pertains to the district Governing Board. After discussion, the group suggested that the planning agenda should include a "partially meets" statement and then have the district Governing Board address - pattern of orientation. The district Governing Board would be giving the planning agenda for the sections that apply to them. The co-chairs for the Standard might go back to those areas where no planning agenda is indicated and outline on a sheet and plan to meet to discuss with Deanna Weeks, Mike Wangler, and Gerri Perri.

There were some minor language adjustments discussed.

Keren Brooks addressed the survey statistics as it applies to outlining its results into this Standard. The Standard compares faculty and staff statistics right next to each other. In the introduction, the standard might address in more detail why the difference exists. For instance, many staff by virtue of their positions are not available.

A discussion with the group ensued on how to address "neutral" survey results and response rates in the self-study. If there are things that reflect a low percentage of staff and faculty, look at issues for the institution and discuss rationales for low response %.

A. Nesta pointed out that a concern that is addressed in all standards is the need for more resources.

K. Nette suggested that the response rates from faculty and staff be addressed in the

demographic profile or intro and isolate some factors.

A further discussion was brought forward on how to address the overarching planning agendas that cut across the institution and how to address in each of the standards.

Standard III:

In IIIA the group discussed how to address SLOs in this standard and the correct language to be used. Since the SLOs are not specifically addressed through the United Faculty contract, they can be brought forth on the faculty syllabus.

In IIIB there are some missing narrative sections. A general comment for this standard subsection is to add more information in the description portion of the standard and explain the process in more detail and how the plan came to be.

IIIC is a good example of the level of depth that we need in both the description and evaluation sections. The narrative is quite thorough but needs to indicate the difference between general funds and block grants to include reference to other technology resources ex: science technology, automotive technology. The group evaluated the planning agenda and it needs to be rewritten to include more resources, and to verify funding from the state that funds technology.

IIID: The group noted that only statistics were stated in the evaluation portion of this standard. The group agreed more information needed to be explained and addressed in this standard. The allocation models in reference to the budget need to be addressed including that it is adequately accepted and resources are limited. One overarching comment for this sub-section was that it seemed to focus on the district and not on the college - needs to be more specific to the college. In IIID1C the college has an

ending balance to be addressed and evidence cited.

### ***3. Demographics Draft Update***

K. Brooks addressed the group on updates concerning the demographics information to be included in the self-study. She did some researching on Chaldean population and only came across Arab ancestry, so is not able to use. She did find in census statistics a comparison for the state, and San Diego county is one of the top 10 in the country for Arab population. In addition there is evidence mid-eastern population has increased 34%.

### ***4. Other - Evidence Reminder***

Discussion on how to cite the references listed in the standards. A consistent numbering system will be formulated by the Editing team.

A question from the group on when the self-study would be posted to the website. According to the recently published timelines, the shared governance review process will start in March, and a preliminary copy will be sent to the Board at the same time it is disseminated through the shared governance process. The final version of the self-study will be reviewed by the Steering Committee at the February 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. In order to adhere to this time line two more scheduled meetings need to occur. Perhaps a special meeting should be scheduled in January to review the planned agendas. The group was amenable to holding a steering committee meeting on January 19th.