Accreditation Summit  
Wednesday, August 17, 2011  
9:30 am - CE-225

Attending: Aracely Aguiar, Celena Alcala, Mary-Jo Apigo, William Bucher, Judy Chow, Adrienne Foster, Allan Hansen, Eric Ichon, Fran Leonard, Betsy Regalado, Abel Rodriguez, Scott Stamler, Yvonne Simone, Bob Sprague, Alice Taylor, Rebecca Tillberg, Hansel Tsai

Guests: Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh, Mister Searcy (ASO)

Fran Leonard welcomed the members of each standards committee in CE-225 at 9:30 am. She announced the theme for today’s Summit is Destination: Accreditation and the agenda was projected on the screen. A handout of editing tips by Deborah Kaye was handed out along with dates of Accreditation Steering Committee meetings for fall 2011 and deadlines for submitting the self-study draft. The deadline for submitting the final draft is October 3rd as Michelle Long-Coffee has to have everything finalized by November 15th to go to the printer. The final submission of the self-study will go to the Board in December.

Receiving feedback: As determined by the timeline, feedback must be received no later than Friday, September 16, 2011 by the Accreditation Steering Committee, which meets on September 20, 2011 to consider the feedback.

Status of Standards - Standard I – Institutional Effectiveness – two major sections, IA. and IB. Rebecca Tillberg reported that 1.B. was sent to Alice for editing and compiling evidence.

II.A. – Instructional Programs - William Bucher, faculty co-chair, reported the process of gathering evidence and additional refinement of this draft.

II.C. – Judy Chow, Library & Learning Resources – Judy is working with Ken Lee, Ken Lin, Tim Russell and Diane Matsuno to finalize II.C.

Alice Taylor stated that the language of standards is repetitive and redundant. Jack Pond of ACCJC says that the repetition was done “on purpose” by the Commission to thread effectiveness and assessment throughout the standards. The challenge is to be concise, to avoid repetition while being responsive.

II.B. Yvonne Simone, faculty co-chair states that II.B. has completed their work and await feedback for final refinements/trimming down. Fran mentioned that Deborah Kaye noted the quality of II.B’s evidence/documentation.
III. A. Human Resources – Hansel Tsai reported that they have completed their draft and will make revisions if needed.

III.B. Physical Resources – Allan’s team continues refining the draft.

III.C. Technology Resources – John Oester is nearing completion of revised draft with documentation.

III.D. Financial Resources – John Oester is putting finishing touches on draft.

IV. Leadership & Governance – still working on reducing draft, per suggestions from Deborah Kaye. Take what we know and share what we know with other areas on campus.

Previous Recommendations
Discussion about Campus Climate – includes Standard I, III, IV. Fran reported that West has made considerable progress since 2006. Fran reminded each standard to reference the appropriate recommendations – all of these have been resolved since 2006 – problem solve, manage enrollment, fiscally responsible as summarized in the handout shared with everyone.

Posting drafts – at Google Docs – pdf format for review only, accessible to anyone with a West LA email address.

Standards members can email their input to Fran and Judith Fierro

The Commission does not recommend a Minority Report. You can/should report dissenting views on issues but the College has a well-established governance policy and practice. The Accreditation Steering Committee will consider all feedback provided by September 16, 2011.

President Abu-Ghazaleh greeted the committee and spoke briefly on accreditation as he had been a co-chair of a standards committee in the past and served on visiting teams. He is looking forward to reading a semi-final document to learn about West. This will be an action plan for ourselves that is mirrored by the recommendations that will help reaffirm the college while becoming a better place to study and work at.

Those present then engaged in reading/responding to drafts of standards other than their own. Cross-standard review broadens one’s perspective and deepens understanding across all standards.