MINUTES

Feb. 10, 2014
3-5 PM, Winlock
Members Presents: Adrienne Foster, Mary-Jo Apigo, Phyllis Braxton, Ken Takeda, Rebecca Tillberg, Alice Taylor (chairing)

I. Minutes of January 13 approved

II. Homework review (Alice Taylor)

Rec. 5 assigned to Ara Aguilar and Rec. 6 assigned to Kathy Walton
Bob Sprague will see that these analyses are submitted before the March 10 meeting.

2006 Rec 6 assigned to Phyllis Braxton (attached)
Alice Taylor noted that Phyllis Braxton had paraphrased the language form the various reports, which is helpful in reaching a shared understanding.

Bob Sprague suggested we compare our current staffing levels in student services to those of 2005/2006; Ken Takeda noted that we are now back to our 2008 budget level.

2006 Rec. 13 assigned to Adrienne Foster; she undertook to have her analysis ready before the March 10 meeting.

III. Accreditation Matters (Newsletter) (Alice Taylor)

No. 1, Planning: the committee reviewed a draft and Alice Taylor undertook to make the suggested changes and circulate the final draft to the committee before publishing it. The accreditation webpage also needs to be updated, with a highly visible timeline and call for participation, and links to ASCCC resources on accreditation.

No. 2 (March), SLOs: Alice Taylor will draft this newsletter well before the March 10 meeting.

No. 3 (April), Budget and No. 4 (May), Participation. Recs. 5 and 6, and Rec. 6 of 2006 should be addressed in sidebars in these newsletters.

It was suggested that Cyrus Helf be recruited to help with newsletters, based on the high quality of his newsletter for distance ed instructors.

IV. ACCJC training at LATTC March 7 (Sprague)
The president has not indicated who should be on the team of 10 who attend this training. Bob Sprague wrote to ask him to decide, as people need to set the time aside.

The committee considered the possibility of sending Standards chairs to this training, but decided that the college’s standing committees should have the major role in structuring our work on the 2016 Self-Evaluation. Bob Sprague and Adrienne Foster will review all the standing committees and align them with the standards.

V. Report on ASCCC Accreditation Institute Feb. 7-8 (Foster, Taylor, Braxton, Sprague)

The Jan. 10 draft of the standards was the focus of our review of the Institute. ACCJC staff made it clear that colleges are subject to the new standards as soon as the Commission adopts them. There is no grace period. They may be adopted as early as June 2014. We need to be ready to deal with them, which requires proactive planning now.

Several sessions touched on institution-set standards for student achievement. It was noted that colleges are approaching this in a variety of ways. It is key that the college understand what is intended by our own standards, and uses the results. They were set by the PIE Committee, but need to be revisited to assure college-wide buy-in.

A session raised the idea of having faculty coaches for data use.

VI. Draft Accreditation Standards (emailed by A. Foster Jan. 30)

Data needs: the draft standards call for disaggregated data. Rebecca Tillberg reported that LA Mission College’s SLO data management system is available for district-wide use and that Andy Duran at the district will be testing it. There is district funding for this. (Valley is using the Mission system; they hired someone to install and maintain it.) Although it tracks SLO achievement at the student level and generates reports on the section level, it does not roll up from the course to the program level, nor does it create summary reports. Mary-Jo Apigo also reported that Mission’s system might not accommodate assessment via multiple-choice items.

She noted that the shift to Mission’s system would require our faculty to learn a new system, but that it would be worthwhile. In the meantime, we need to continue our current cycle and finish setting the calendars; they would carry over when we adopted a new system.

Bob Sprague asked about where the additional resources that will be needed to gather the required data should be focused—at the college or the district level? While Ken Takeda provided examples of efficiency attained with district-wide enterprise systems (like payroll and facilities work orders),
Rebecca Tillberg gave examples of single colleges serving as the only workable impetus to innovation (e.g., IES).

The ASCCC is seeking comments via Phil Smith at Los Rios. Email him at smithp@arc.losrios.edu to be added to the discussion. To respond directly to the ACCJC, write to Krista Johns at kjohns@accjc.org.

At the Accreditation Institute push-back was evident on changes to library and counseling and to employment issues.

Alice Taylor proposed a two-pronged approach: that we review the proposed standards carefully both to help clarify them or correct them where possible, and that we be mindful of where we should be ready to adopt them because they fit our aspirations or current practice.

Bob Sprague noted that Academic Affairs is ready to check on the program maps for all our majors, and suggest that those for which we do not offer all the required courses be archived.

VII. No other business