ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

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

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

Agenda Item	Discussion

1. Approve Minutes

The minutes were approved. M/S/A with two abstentions.

2. Review Team Compositions

Standard I: G. Perri reported on the status of ASCC representation on this standard. She is in the process of discussing with Sharon Barrett, Student Affairs Dean, to establish the representation of the ASCC on the Steering Committee and other standards. In addition, a request went out to Maggie Gonzales to recruit another classified member for this standard. Dr. Perri also indicated the need for faculty representation, since she is not sure of Marvelyn Bucky's availability.

Standard II: C. Chiriboga reported that Joe Marron will join this Standard under the subsection B. She explained that each subsection had a representative chair to form a mini steering committee for this standard. C. Chiriboga asked T. McNeil to check with Marsh Fralick on continuing as chair for Standard IIB.

Standard III: A. Satele reported that Standards IIIB, C and D are in need of student representation.

Standard IV: Jan Ford introduced the discussion of how to address the question of inactive members. Inactive members should remain on the roster as evidence of participation and as contacts for draft review.

T. McNeil commented that she prefer the initial member names on the Committee list remain to show the diversity of those contributing and this was accepted by the Committee. It was agreed the chairs of the standards would report back on list of individuals and length of service in order to collect full information regarding standard membership.

3. Standard Draft Updates

Standard IV: G. Morones updated the group on this standard. He indicated that the description and evaluation portions of this section are almost complete. Some sections are still pending, and are anticipated to be finished in the next two weeks. He also stated that areas relating to the Board, the committee did not feel comfortable making recommendations in this area, and will leave that decision to the Steering Committee. It was suggested that the President and Accreditation Steering Committee co-chairs dialogue with the Board on these areas to assure commitment from them. The Steering Committee will review the drafts, and then come up with final recommendations. G. Morones continued to report that the Grossmont and Cuyamaca Standard IV are having a joint meeting this afternoon to touch base on evidence and mapping.

Standard III: D. Riley reported on IIIC & D. The writing team is in the process of going through the Planning Agenda. She stated that there are recommendations concerning district funding to be addressed. After reviewing this section it was suggested that evaluation sections should address the inadequate resources available to the College – particularly fiscal. While fiscal processes are strong and effective - a point to be made in the Self Study – the fact remains that overall the College faces severe financial constraints. An approach that was recommended is to possibly explain in the self-study the challenges of how goals are addressed when there is not enough money to carry out the College's strategic plan.

A. Satele reported on IIIA & B and indicated the description is almost done and another week is necessary to finalize the evaluation sections.

Standard II: A. Nesta reported that the descriptions and evaluations are done for this standard. The mini-steering committee of this standard will go through the planning agenda action plans for these areas, and bring back to the Steering Committee.

Standard I: G. Perri reported that the mission statement is being revised and is going through the shared governance review process before submission to the Board. She stated that the Academic Senate is on the 1st reading, once approved then will be forwarded to Innovation & Planning Council for action, then sent to District Education Council, and then can forward to the Board.

K. Nette added that a few evaluation sections need updating.

Eligibility Standards: C. Chiriboga reported that T. McNeil and M. Wangler worked over the summer on this area of the self-study. T. McNeil completed drafts regarding eligibility standards. M. Wangler is drafting stand alone essays on accreditation themes to be reviewed by the Steering Committee.

Drafts of the self-study standards to include editing changes must be submitted no later than 9/15. At this time, the co-chairs of the standards will be given an opportunity to review the editor's version and then work on action plans. It was suggested that the committees try and include more survey data in their evaluation sections.

As well, committees were asked to review their evidence list and to seek additional specific information to be used such as agenda, minutes, workshops and seminars from the last couple years. Each standard tends to reference the same documents: however, diversified evidence is vital for each evaluation section. It was suggested that the committees try to reference

standard-specific evidence when possible.

C. Chiriboga and M. Wangler will send out a joint memo to all the co-chairs of Cuyamaca shared governance committees to have the last two years of agenda and minutes available on the accreditation website. D. Miller will take the lead in compiling committee documents to be posted to the website.

If there is a particular policy that needs to be followed for longer then the two years, G. Perri suggested having all the agenda and minutes available on an accessible CD for the visiting team.

4. Action Plans

What does a good action plan look like? C. Chiriboga referenced the WASC handouts for the group to work through when determining the action plan. The recommendations should flow logically from the evaluation section.

Process: The Accreditation Steering Committee will determine the recommendations for the college. In terms of addressing standards, action plans should focus on two types of issues: (1) are there processes that need attention; and (2) are there processes that need improvement in the future.

As a college, what do we want? We need more resources. G. Perri reiterated the importance of being cautious in responding to recommendations. J. Ford suggested the Committee review the recommendations brought forward from the standards, and determine if there is an overarching college-wide recommendation throughout all the standards that could be formulated.

The Steering Committee agreed to develop overarching college-wide recommendations and then cross reference to particular standard sections.

5. SLO Update

M. Wangler distributed the handbook for writing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) into course outlines. He explained the process involved with SLOs and Curriculum.

Evidence should show the status of SLOs in standard areas. M.Wangler will provide examples of Program Review SLOs.

6. Other

Evidence:

G. Morones inquired as to the best way to submit the financial aid procedures manual into evidence. A. Nesta indicated that hard copy or electronic copy would be accepted.

A. Nesta inquired to the co-chairs on how does the visiting team want the evidence available to them? C. Chiriboga preferred the documentation, if at all possible, be available on the website. C. Chiriboga did say big documents can be sent in hard copy, but whenever possible have both electronic and hard copy available.

J. Ford inquired if there would be a list of all the website documents. There is an alphabetical listing of all electronic documents currently on the Accreditation website.

A. Nesta requested that all evidence be sent to the library as soon as possible, and to go through each standard and identify each reference made on the description/evaluation sections so they can be reported on the evidence list and sent to the library

C. Chiriboga tasked the Accreditation Assistant with verifying the evidence listed in standard documentation is identified properly on the corresponding evidence list and to follow up on the website to check for its listing there as well.