

Accreditation Meeting
October 26, 2006
4PM – 5PM
District Board Room

Attendees: Eric Raznick, Marilyn McBride; Sandra Comerford, Kathy Hasson, Pat Griffin, Sue Harrison, Jing Luan, Harry Joel, Alain Cousin (Associated Students), Jose Nunez, Ray Hernandez arrived late.

It was noted that Donna Bestock would not be in attendance and that Ray Hernandez was on his way.

Jing handed out printed copies of a functional map that was created by LACCD. This map lays out the district office, district wide and college responsibilities pertaining to accreditation. He also distributed a document created by Fresno City College detailing functional lines of responsibility. He indicated that these documents would be discussed later in the meeting.

Jing asked the accreditation co-chairs for status reports in order to provide an understanding as to where the colleges are at this point.

Marilyn McBride reported for Cañada. Their first draft came in just before spring semester. The drafts were minimal and the team was unable to critique the documents over the summer as planned. Consequently, the timelines were revised and second drafts are due on October 31. Some issues at Cañada included completing the research, understanding the new standards, and the need for extra time for committee members. Marilyn indicated that in order to provide the accreditation team with some additional time, all standing committee meetings had been suspended. The second drafts will be reviewed after October 31. At that point, the team should be able to pinpoint where additional support is needed. It is anticipated that by mid-December the drafts will be ready to be polished and edited to reflect a common voice. Cañada has assigned “theme” captains who will look at the studies across the standards and will put together material related to the themes. In response to Jose’s question about the standards dealing with facilities, she noted that Linda Da Silva had provided a thorough document. Marilyn indicated that the college had completed surveys and the data is being evaluated. She did note that some of the evidence provided by the District was not tied to any assertion in the document.

Kathy Hasson reported for Skyline. She indicated that the standard drafts had been reviewed by the steering committee. She indicated that there was still quite a bit of work to be done and that second drafts will be due Mid-November. At that point, the documents will be reviewed again and edited for voice. She indicated that there would need to be a good deal more evidence provided.

Marilyn noted that she was surprised at lack of depth of some of the responses. She indicated that sometimes the writing veered away from the question posed by the standard. .

Kathy noted that there was a considerable amount of mixing of the descriptive summary section and evaluation section. Skyline intends to provide more training and further evaluation. They have completed quite a bit of research including surveys of students and employees. The research office also held a round of briefings with committee members and college groups. She noted that the employee survey was promoted widely with pencils, chocolates. They had hoped for a 75% response but only got 46%. Analysis of the employee survey will be completed in November.

Sandra Comerford, faculty co-chair, reported for CSM. She talked about the accreditation team organization at CSM. Each standard has a committee including faculty and administrators. There was a kick-off meeting with all members early in the process. Three surveys had been administered including faculty/administration, classified staff and students. The first drafts of the documents were due at the end of spring. Over the summer, the committees reviewed the documents and provided extensive feedback. Since August, there have been two more meetings. A follow-up survey was done at the beginning of the semester because the co-chairs indicated that they needed more in-depth information from employees. These surveys were tailored to specific information the committees said they needed. In terms of the writing, Sandra indicated that people were confusing the descriptive summary information and the assessment information. CSM drafted a sample standard to give to the committees to help with this. Eric Raznick indicated that the sample standard had been helpful. Sandra noted that each committee has assigned a “theme” person and that meetings are scheduled in November to address these themes.

Jing indicated that he understood that the accreditation commission did not consider the themes to be critical. Pat disagreed and said that commission had indicated that themes are important. Eric Raznick noted that the wording of the standards often made the writing difficult. Kathy indicated that the evaluation guide provided by the commission give good guidelines as to how to answer the questions.

At this point in the meeting, Ray Hernandez, Skyline College, arrived. He gave timelines for Skyline and noted that the second draft will be due beginning of December. He indicated that the teams had questions regarding gathering evidence and it was suggested that Kathy could be invited to meetings to facilitate this process.

Jing addressed the group and indicated that his role is to make sure that standards related to district information will be well coordinated and factual. He discussed the functional map samples with the group and indicated that the District should prepare a similar document and asked who would develop this map and how it would be developed. Marilyn wanted to know what exactly what commission wants. Jing indicated that commission wants a functional map but that the LACCD map may be too wordy and the Fresno City map may be too sketchy.

Pat indicated that her understanding is that commission wants to be clear that the colleges and district are talking to one another. She also noted that if work to develop a functional map falls on the colleges then a map similar to Fresno's would be used simply because the colleges don't have personnel or time to do the more complex model.

Kathy Hasson. said that it would be possible to create a model in between LACCD and Fresno. She indicated that some sort of coding system or rubric might be developed that would give more depth to a functional map without resorting to the LACCD model. She thought that the research departments at the colleges and Jing could develop a model. Jing indicated that this is a document that could be used across the district and said he would work with researchers to develop this tool.

Next, Jing addressed the issue of making sure that District is giving accurate and appropriate information to the colleges. He indicated that the DO should help connect the evidence to the standard. He said he will inventory documentation that has been sent to colleges already and make sure they get information that ties the evidence to the standards. Jing indicated that the District shouldn't be assessing itself, however, Marilyn thinks that district has the expertise in these areas and should write this. She thinks that her folks at Cañada who are writing should be talking with District. Pat said they encouraged their committees to put DO staff on the committees. By doing so the DO members had dialogue within their committees. She indicated that this system was working well at CSM.

Jing asked if there were any need to discuss factual materials. CSM indicated that they are ok with information so far but that it would be helpful to have a list of documents sorted according to standards. This would allow them to make sure all pieces of evidence tie to standards.

Harry handed out a revised standard IVB1. This version is more complete than the original version and an electronic version will be emailed to the group.

A discussion was held regarding the College and District Mission statements. Pat indicated that the college mission statements are going to board in March. It was suggested that the DO Mission be reviewed after colleges are done with theirs.

Jing asked if the group should meet again. Pat thought that it would be necessary in order to review the functional map. Jing indicated that he will schedule a follow up meeting in January.

It was noted that Kathy Hasson, Sandra Comerford and John Seward should be on the on email distribution for the next meeting.

Jose indicated that Linda Da Silva should be removed from the list.