COLLEGE of the DESERT

Accreditation Committee

MINUTES FOR Friday, December 4, 2015	12:00 p.m.	Cravens Student Services Center, Multipurpose Room
Members Present:	Annebelle Nery (Co-Chair), Bert Bitanga (Co-Chair), Courtney Doussett, Daniel Martinez, Donna Greene, Joel Kinnamon, Kim Dozier, Leslie Young, Lisa Howell, Wendy Sanders	
Members not Present:	Kelly Hall	
Guest(s):	Diane Wirth, Gene Durand, John Ramont, Jon Fernald, Lisa Soccio, Sheri Willis, Stella Baker	
Recorder:	Mary Lou Marrujo	

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Roll Call – Quorum was met.		
2. Action Item(s)		
2.1 Approval of Agenda		
DISCUSSION		
CONCLUSION	Approved as submitted.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.2 Approval of October 30, 2015 Minutes		
DISCUSSION		
CONCLUSION	Approved as submitted.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
3. Information/Discussion Item(s)		
3.1 Introductions – new team members		
DISCUSSION	There were a few new team members, so there introductions around the table.	
CONCLUSION		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
3.2 Update on Team Structures		
DISCUSSION	Classified staff have expressed they are ready to participate in this process. As co-chairs are now forming their teams, Annebelle recommended that they begin identifying who they would like to add to their team. For faculty members, the co-chairs may seek their faculty representatives. If you have a staff request, Mary Lou will work with CSEA on the appointment for your Standard. If you have a preference for a specific skill and/or person, let Mary Lou know and she will make the request through CSEA. If you need a student representative, we can do that as well.	

Annebelle went around the table to discuss each teams' structure and plan on how to proceed:

STANDARD I – Courtney Doussett

- Will be inviting the chairs of all the major plans, e.g., BSI, Student Equity, SSSP credit and non-credit, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, etc.

Annebelle recommended that since they are an overarching group, the chairs of the plans can be standing advisory groups and meet with them as needed. She added they should meet with the chairs of those groups individually and once they have an integrated document, they can then bring them all together.

- ASCOD representative
- IEPI member (Daniel Martinez)
- Student Life Director, Carlos Maldonado, Scott Cooper, Dean, for the student discipline piece

Once they discuss the Standard over with Carlos, find out what role students play in this Standard.

STANDARD II – A – Leslie Young

- Chairs of Outcomes and Assessment and Curriculum
- ASCOD representative
- Request Roz Weissmann and Jojie Magbuhat as staff appointments for Instructional Programs

Staff appointments are not needed yet, but can be put in place.

STANDARD II – B – Donna Greene

- ASCOD representative. Donna has already contacted the Director of Student Life.
- Staff member from the Tutoring & Academic Skills Center (TASC) with specific skills to be determined
- Faculty member from TASC

STANDARD II – C

Annebelle will work with co-chair Racquel Schoenfeld, who was unable to attend today's meeting.

Annebelle will request one of the directors from CORE services or perhaps Jeff Baker, Interim Vice President of Student Services, to take over as co-chair for student services.

She added that perhaps the incoming director of TASC will take over for the Library Learning Support Services section temporarily.

- Student representative; one for special programs and one for CORE services.

STANDARD III – A

Lisa Soccio advised that Chris Jones-Cage, a professor in Psychology, has expressed an interest in serving as co-chair of the human resources team. She has served on an accreditation team in the past.

STANDARD III – B – Lisa Howell

- Facilities Advisory Committee
- Director of Maintenance and Operations
- Citizens Oversight Committee
- Facilities consultant

Annebelle recommended Lisa introduce this standard at the next Facilities Advisory Committee meeting. Forward agendas and minutes to Mary Lou.

Lisa Soccio expressed an interest in co-chairing the Physical Resources section.

STANDARD III – C – Sheri Willis and Kim Dozier

- Christen Smith, Chair of Educational Technologies committee
- Donna Greene, Instructional Design Coordinator
- Kim Dozier, Distance Ed subcommittee
- Classified staff – Michael Harlow and Michael Gayle
- Glenn King, Director of Network Services and Telecommunications
- Jose Rodriguez, student on Administrative Computer Committee
- With assistance from Katie Chartier, Assistant Director of First Year Experience, identifying students

STANDARD III – D – Lisa Howell
- Budget Subcommittee, which includes different groups on campus, including students

Faculty representation needed. Bert stated he would put a call out to faculty.

STANDARD IV – Joel Kinnamon
- Will work with Alumni Association to identify business leader(s)
- Needs to identify a trustee
- Foundation
- Educational Consortium

Annebelle was asked to clarify the writing prompts. She responded, any writing that relates to the question in collecting evidence. Basically, (a) did we meet it,

	(b) no, we didn't, (c) are we making any progress, and where is the evidence to support it. She added that we need to make an argument that we met the standard, we exceeded the standard, or we're in progress towards the standard.
CONCLUSION	• Submit requests for staff and student team members to Mary Lou. • Familiarize yourselves with documents and standards • Start meeting with groups/committees/staff/students to begin gathering information and devising a plan of action

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Submit requests for staff through CSEA (Lauro Jimenez) • Submit requests for students through Student Life (Carlos Maldonado) • Put a call out for faculty representation on Standard III-D. • Start meeting with groups/committees/staff/students • Forward self-study for Napa Community College to committee. When Los Angeles Community College's is self-study is posted, also forward that to the committee	Mary Lou Marrujo Mary Lou Marrujo Bert Bitanga Committee members Mary Lou Marrujo	

3.3 Accreditation Web Site

DICUSSION	Bert brought up the accreditation web site on the overhead screen and pointed out where to find resource documents, archived documents, and where we will begin uploading the evidence documents for each Standard. Annebelle advised to identify evidence documents using the following three rubrics: resource allocation, planning, and outcomes assessment. When forwarding documents to Mary Lou, include the date, the document name, and identify the applicable Standard. In some cases, the document may be relevant to all three areas of a particular Standard. In those cases, a copy should be filed within each of the three areas of that Standard. As documents and drafts are updated on committees in your area (e.g. technology master plan, facilities plan, staffing plan), this is great evidence. Documents may include agendas and minutes. We may begin archiving these documents. Annebelle commented that there is no better training than an accreditation site visit. She encouraged team members to participate in at least one. The following team members expressed interest in participating on a site visit: Bert Bitanga, Lisa Howell, Diane Wirth, Wendy Sanders, Courtney Doussett and Leslie Young.
CONCLUSION	• Forward evidence documents to Mary Lou to post on the accreditation web site. Include the name and date of the document, as well as the Standard. • Contact Mary Lou to assist in searching for supporting documents and/or data for the past five years relative to your Standard.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

• Forward the names of those interested in participating on a site visit to Dr. Kinnamon.	Mary Lou	

3.4 Writing guidelines for Standards

DICUSSION	Rick Rawnsley will be integrating the document with the writing guidelines. He has provided these guidelines (under Resources on the Accreditation web site), should you wish to refer to them.
CONCLUSION	Refer writing guideline questions to Mary Lou. Drafts of the document will be deferred to Rick.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

3.5 Quality Focus Essay (QFE) Evaluation Tool

DICUSSION	Bert discussed a new requirement as part of the ISER (Institutional Self-Study Report), the QFE (Quality Focus Essay-copy attached) As the teams begin sharing information and finding issues, we will need to identify two or three "action projects" for further study. These narratives will need to be more detailed and include a thorough action plan, which we will be held accountable.
CONCLUSION	

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

3.6 Team attending Accreditation Institution, February 19-20 in San Diego

DICUSSION	The following team members are interested in attending this workshop in February (copy attached): Bert Bitanga, Courtney Doussett, Diane Wirth, Donna Greene, Gene Durand, Kim Dozier, Leslie Young, Lisa Howell, Lisa Soccio, Sheri Willis, and Wendy Sanders.
CONCLUSION	• Mary Lou will handle reservations and prepare travel forms.

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

3.7 Future meeting dates

DICUSSION	Standards Team will meet in February and the Accreditation Team will meet in March. Dates to be announced.
CONCLUSION	

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

4. Adjournment: 1:26 p.m.

NEXT MEETING:
TBA

The Quality Focus Essay

When an institution undertakes self-evaluation for accreditation, it may identify policies, procedures, or practices in need of change or student outcomes it wishes to improve. An institution may make some changes or improvements immediately, before an evaluation team arrives. Other changes and strategies for improving outcomes will require a longer time to accomplish. These changes and strategies should be identified as the institution's plans for improvement (action plans), and should be integrated into the ongoing planning and decision making processes at the college, with timelines for completion. Using the format of a Quality Focus Essay (QFE), an institution will identify two or three "action projects" for further study and action that have good potential for improving student outcomes. The projects should be related to Accreditation Standards, emerge from the institution's examination of its own effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of student learning and student achievement, be based on the institution's analysis of data collected, and identify areas of needed change, development, and improvement. The Guide provides questions intended to stimulate discussion and assist the institution in selecting appropriate action projects for the QFE in boxed format proceeded by the notation QFE. The QFE, with a 5,000 word limit, describes the projects in detail to include the following components:

- Identification of the Projects: The projects should be vital to the long-term improvement of student learning and achievement over a multi-year period;
- Desired Goals/Outcomes: The QFE should describe specific, well-defined goals expected to lead to observable results;
- Actions/Steps to be Implemented: The QFE (or an Appendix to the QFE) should provide the steps to be implemented for each project;
- Timeline: The QFE (or Appendix) should include a calendaring of all steps to be implemented;
- Responsible Parties: The QFE should provide clear lines of responsibility for implementation and sustainability;
- Resources: The QFE should include a realistic plan for the resources (human, physical, technology, or financial resources) the institution will need in order to implement and sustain the projects;
- Assessment: The QFE should include the institution's plan for evaluating the outcomes and effectiveness of the projects.

The comprehensive evaluation team and the Commission will review and provide constructive feedback on the QFE, with the goal of supporting institutional efforts to enhance student learning and achievement. At the Midterm, the institution will provide a progress report or, if the projects are completed, a final report on the outcomes of the projects.

H. Quality Focus Essay Continuous quality improvement is a mark of institutional effectiveness. As an institution evaluates its programs and services in the continuous cycle of data analysis, planning, resource allocation, and evaluation, it examines its effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of student learning and student achievement. During that examination, it identifies areas of needed change, development, institutionalization, and expansion. Within the accreditation focus on continuous quality improvement, the institution will identify two or three areas coming out of the institutional self-evaluation on which the institution has decided to act (action projects), and which will have significance over a multi-year period. These will be described in a Quality Focus Essay (QFE). The Essay will have a 5,000 word limit and will discuss in detail the identified areas to be acted upon, including responsible parties, timeline, and anticipated outcomes, and the impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Essay will be related to the Accreditation Standards; institutions should select the "action projects" for the QFE from college data and analysis. The projects described in the QFE should be realistic and culminate in a set of observable and measurable outcomes. The Essay should be consistent in its factual basis and analysis with the other portions of the college's Self Evaluation Report. It will provide the institution with multi-year, long-term directions for improvement and demonstrate the institution's commitment to excellence. The areas identified in the Essay will become critical focal points for the institution's Midterm Report. Evaluation teams and the Commission will comment on the institution's QFE and may offer constructive advice or assistance.

Appendix L:
Evaluation Tool for Assessing the Quality Focus Essay

AP= Action Projects   QFE= Quality Focus Essay

1. The QFE describes two or three areas, Action Projects (AP), coming out of the institutional self evaluation upon which the institution has decided to act.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the QFE- 1 point	Addressed adequately in the QFE- 2 points	Addressed well in the QFE- 3 points

2. The Action Projects (AP) come out of the institution's examination of its effectiveness in providing student learning and achievement in the context of its mission.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP- 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

3. The data and analysis used as a basis for selecting the AP are described.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

Question 1-3 Assessment Narrative:

4. The QFE identifies the areas of needed change, development, institutionalization, and/or expansion.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the QFE- 1 point	Addressed adequately in the QFE- 2 points	Addressed well in the QFE- 3 points

5. The QFE discusses in detail the AP, and includes the manner of implementation, timelines, and integration with ongoing, integrated planning, resource allocation, and re-evaluation processes at the institution.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

6. The AP activities as described are realistic and will have significance over a multi-year period.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

Question 4-6 Assessment Narrative:

7. The anticipated outcomes and impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness are detailed for the AP.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

8. The AP outcomes are observable and measurable.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

9. The AP are related to the Accreditation Standards and are consistent with other portions of the institution's Self Evaluation Report.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

Question 7-9 Assessment Narrative:

10. Over all, the AP demonstrate the institution's commitment to excellence.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

Question 10 Assessment Narrative:

POINTS:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____
TOTAL: _____

A score of below twenty, or more than two responses with a score of 1 or less, will require that the institution revise its essay for submission within one year.

ACADEMIC SENATE
for CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

| Enter keyword or phrase | FIND |

➕ IN THIS SECTION...

2016 Accreditation Institute

Event Date: February 19, 2016 - 8:00am to February 20, 2016 - 12:00pm

Location: Marriott Mission Valley - San Diego   San Diego

Deadline to Register/Application Deadline: January 16, 2016

Whether your college is gathering evidence, writing the self- evaluation, or preparing for a site visit in spring, the Academic Senate for California Community College's Accreditation Institute will provide guidance and support no matter where you are in the cycle of accreditation. Even colleges that finished a site visit in fall know that accreditation work never really ends. At its core, accreditation is the peer-evaluation process we use to improve the education we offer to individuals in our communities, and we have affirmed our commitment to the spirit of such processes throughout the years.

REGISTRATION

REGISTRATION

The Accreditation Institute will be held February 19-20, 2016.

Please use this registration link to register for 2016 Accreditation.
(http://asccc.org/content/2016-accreditation-institute-registration)

Early Registration Deadline: January 27, 2016

REGISTRATION FEES

Early Registration Fee (before January 27, 2016): $415

Late Registration Fee (before January 27, 2016): $465

One Day Presenter Registration: $80

Two Day Presenter Registration: $160

The cost includes breakfast and lunch on Friday, breakfast on Saturday, evening reception on Friday and materials.

Payment in full is required prior to attending the event. Attendees that registered before January 27th must pay before Janaury 27th in order to secure the early registration rate. Call our office at (916) 445-4753 with questions.

CANCELLATIONS

The cancellation deadline for a full refund is January 27, 2016 and will be assessed a $50 processing fee. Refunds will not be granted for cancellations after the posted cancellation deadline of January 27, 2016. Please keep in mind that registrations are transferable. Please review the Senate Cancellation Policy here (http://asccc.org/cancellation-policy).

Call Edie Martinelli, Event Planner at (916) 445-4753 x 102 with any payment questions.

HOTEL & TRAVEL