

SMCCCD Accreditation Coordination Meeting
Wednesday, February 28, 2007
Minutes

Attendees: Ray Hernandez, Harry Joel, Cathy Hasson, Donna Bestock, Juanita Alunan, Sandra Stefani Comerford, Alicia Aguirre, Marilyn McBride, Jing Luan

Jing began the meeting by thanking all attendees for coming to their second meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Status Reports From Co-Chairs (latest draft review and board review month)

The self-study response to the commission is due in August. Everyone was in agreement that all three colleges would have their presentations ready for the Board meeting on June 13th. Donna Bestock inquired about the process of presenting the self-studies to the board. The self-studies will come with full approval from the governing bodies, college councils, co-chairs, Presidents and others. The most important part is having the Board sign off on it. The self-studies need to be in a form that is substantially complete because it can not be approved if it is still undergoing revisions.

Any changes that are important for the visiting team to know will have to be submitted as an addendum.

Skyline – Donna reported that draft 2.1 would be on the web tonight. They will be making a general announcement to the people at Skyline that they are welcome to make comments. Vickie will make an announcement at the Board meeting tonight that it is posted on the website and she welcomes their feedback.

CSM - Sandra Comerford reported that their second draft has been up for a month and will be coming off tomorrow. Comments were sent to the co-chairs, who will make revisions, then repost the 3rd draft on April 9th for two weeks for additional comments. CSM decided not have open forums because so much was done online.

Cañada – Alicia Aguirre and Marilyn McBride reported that their first public viewing will be on the web March 9th for two weeks for comments. An all college meeting is scheduled on March 20th where they will be asking for comments. It will be taken off on March 30th to begin making final editing changes. By April 30th it will be on the agenda of the shared governance bodies for approval. Cañada will be holding forums.

There was concern whether the Board members know that the self-studies are posted online, where they can review them and provide comments. This is for review and not approval. This is the next to the last step. It was recommended that the Board members receive the documents at the same time as the approval process begins during 3rd draft review. This would give Board members a full month to review the documents.

In summary, the committee was in agreement that third draft copies of all three colleges will be available online for viewing at the beginning of May. The board will be specifically invited to look at the third draft. Hard copies will be sent to the Board members to review at least 2 week before the June 13th Board meeting. Seek approval of documents at the June 13th Board meeting.

Functional Map Development (Cathy, Jing)

Based on other samples, Cathy Hasson developed a functional map, which would be used district wide. It was mentioned that the org chart should be put up front. The committee discussed and suggested changes to who was responsible as primary, secondary or shared responsibility on questionable functions. Many changes were made for the district because both ITS and facilities are under the district function and not college

Jing commended Cathy on her work. She will make the changes discussed and email the revised copy to the committee.

Inventory of Factual Materials Provided by District Personnel and Inclusion of Them in the Self-Study Drafts

Jing distributed copies of the Inventory of Factual Materials based on what Sue Harrison collected. This is to be used as evidence and a guide to who said what. At this time he is only providing hard copies because it is still in draft form. Once the final copy is completed, it will be available electronically. Jing asked the committee members to review the information and give him feedback.

Donna noticed that in some cases it says provided by and others don't. If the Colleges are challenged, they would like to know in every case **who** in the District provided the evidence, not just the evidence source. Jing explained in some cases no person can be identified, or needs to be since it is web link. It was mentioned that work from distinct had links but no hard copies. Jing stated that the materials provided by the district hard copies or not should be in colleges' evidence bin. Jing will work on locating hard copies and the missing information.

Jing noted that he wasn't aware materials were submitted for Standard 1 by the district. Standards 1 & 2 are about the college. Therefore, the work in this regard is for Standards 3 & mostly 4.

Review of College and District Mission Statements

Jing confirmed with those in attendance that all College Mission Statements have been approved by the Colleges.

The District Shared Governance Council is going to complete the **review** process of the District Mission Statement next Monday. Jing asked if the College contingency groups had reviewed the District Mission Statement.

CONCERN

Sandra is concerned that she heard the District may be changing the web sites. All three colleges need sources online. Will this affect the URL's? When will this change take place? Fall semester was mentioned.

Jing will speak with Eric and report back.

SLOAC (Sandra)

Sandra expressed interest in having a teaching / learning presentation at the September Board meeting to explain SLO's. Much of accreditation is based on student learning and this would prepare the Board members for the accreditation team visit in October. Jing responded that it could be best scheduled for September's regular board session.

OTHER

The group was in agreement that there should be another meeting to review the final drafts and discuss their strategy in presenting them to the Board. Jing suggested that the Chairs should talk to their Presidents and propagate upward to decide how much time is need for the presentation. Other questions that should be discussed: What are the most effective items to cover? What type of visual presentation should be used? (website demo, power point, hard copies) Will time be allowed after each College presentation for questions?

Jing will schedule another meeting toward the middle or end of April. Members will be notified by email.

Unapproved Draft. Regents Only