

ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 8, 2014

2:00PM

CCC-Confer: 1-719-785-4469 or 1-888-450-4821

Participant Passcode: **473082**

Presenter Passcode: **8133756**

Members:

Phil Crawford pjcrwfrd@aol.com San Jose City College

Randy Beach rbeach@swccd.edu Southwestern College

Susanna Gunther susannaelizabeth2020@gmail.com Solano College

Stephanie Curry stephanie.curry@reedleycollege.edu Reedley College

Danny Martino martino\_danielle@sccollege.edu Santiago Canyon College

Biju Raman braman@paloverde.edu Palo Verde College

Michael Heumann michael.heumann@imperial.edu Imperial Valley College

John Stanskas jstanskas@valleycollege.edu San Bernardino Valley College

Attended: Randy Beach, Susanna Gunther, Stephanie Curry, Danny Martino, Michael

Heumann, John Stanskas

Guest: Julie Adams

Absent: Biju Raman and Phil Crawford

I Welcome and Introductions – 2:00PM

II Review of Tasks

1. Accreditation Institute February 20-21, 2015

The committee spent a good deal of time brainstorming possible breakouts for the Institute. See the attached program for details.

Topics included:

* Including and documenting PT Faculty involvement in accreditation processes
* Facilitating Campus-Wide Discussions
* ACCJC, CCSF, and *Restoration Status*
* Human Resources and Professional Development
* SLO Assessment Results, Driving Planning and Budgeting (models?)
* Employee Evaluation Processes
* Integrity, Is It Like Obscenity?
* Boards, Unions and other entities you can’t do anything about but will get dinged for anyway.
* Integrated Planning
* Student Services and Distance Education
* Institutional Set Standards
* Annual Reports, Mid-term Reports, and Faculty Involvement
* What to do when you know you don’t meet the standard
* How to do a self-study

1. ASCCC Paper on Best Practices in Accreditation (Resolution 2.01 S12)

The committee acknowledged the assignment

1. Fall Plenary Session Breakouts – Submitted

Accreditation Topic A:  New Standards

Accreditation Topic B:  Equity and Accreditation - Using SSSP, Equity Plans,

Enrollment Management Plans in the Accreditation Process

 Accreditation Topic C:  Let’s Bitch

 Accreditation Topic D:  Thriving Through Sanctions aka “Thank you, sir may I have another?” or "I have sanctions! now what?"

Assignments should be discussed at Sept. 12 Exec.

III Discussion Items \* see attached information below

1. Faculty Evaluation and SLOs

The committee felt that a resolution for the Fall 2014 Plenary Session was in order to clarify the understanding of faculty that faculty are expected to participate in the institutional SLO process and utilize the results of assessments in their personal growth and development as a faculty member. Faculty do not agree that the results of those assessments are a metric that can be used to evaluate faculty.

1. Visiting Team Recommendations and Commission Actions

The committee recommended that a resolution, potentially from the Executive Committee, and a letter to ACCJC were in order regarding this item. The content of both would include:

* We value the peer review process as a mechanism for reflective evaluation.
* We believe the training and composition of the visiting team should enable the visiting team to provide the commission a comprehensive recommendation.
* We believe the visiting team’s recommendation should be the primary basis of the commission’s actions and should, except in very rare instances, be aligned.
* We believe that in instances where the commission’s actions are not consistent with the visiting team’s recommendation, a transparent justification should be provided.

IV In-person meeting and workflow

In person meeting – San Bernardino Valley College Sept. 20, 10AM – 3PM

\*\*\*Ancillary Topic 1.  Faculty Evals and SLOs

Phil Crawford asked us to consider  an issue we have perrenial irritation with: Standard III A. 1. c. (Faculty Evaluations and SLOs).  The new standards list Standard III A. 6. as "The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for studen learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning."  The Senate has a long standing resolution (2.01 from Fall 2008) with resolved statements that oppose the inclusion of the results of student learning outcomes assessments in faculty evaluations.  There is a history of colleges receiving sanctions due to this clause.  It appears, from the printed language, that faculty are expected to use the results to improve teaching - to my mind that doesn't mean the results are evaluative but the process of SLO evaluation, professional development, and improvement planning are.  It may be a nuanced distinction.  Do we wish to discuss this?  Include this as a breakout on Standard III?  Write a resolution for Fall Plenary clarifying our understanding of the standard?  Discuss, please.

\*\*\*Ancillary Topic 2.  Visiting Team Recommendations and Commission Actions

There is a high degree of irritation with ACCJC regarding City College of San Francisco (CCSF) and the past 18 months of madness.  (I'm not sure how to say this any more neutrally).  The latest salicious revelation, that the recommendation of the visiting team was different than that issued by the Commission, in the L.A. Times article last week has caused renewed fury with ACCJC.  It has been suggested that the Academic Senate should take some action regarding this.  Action could be anything from a resolution (the words 'vote of no confidence' have been bandied about.  I'm not sure what that means in the context of an external organization), a letter from the president, or simply bitter disgust.  It is not unheard of for the Commission to issue sanctions different than those recommended by the visiting team and teams are aware of that in their training.  I am certain this will come up at a Senate Exec. meeting in the future.  I wonder if the best course of action is to have a letter and resolutions that, instead of condemning ACCJC, re-inforces our value of peer review, the importance of training visiting teams such that their recommendations align with the Commission's standards more transparently.  I'm not sure, though and would love some input from you.  Discuss, please.

Useful Links:

<http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Accreditation_Standards_Adopted_June_2014.pdf>

<http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/accreditation-program%201-16-14_0.pdf>