ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF FEBRUARY 6, 2004

In Attendance: Leonor Aguilera, Ruth Babeshoff, Bruce Bromberg, Angel Brea, Betty Cotton, Bob Deegan, Debbie Hjorth, Mary McMullin, Robert Melendez, Michael Parrella, Nga Pham, Julie Slark, Barbara Sproat, John Smith, Terry Wilksen, Barbara, Zunich

Unable to Attend: Fran Cummings, Tricia Evans, Pat Fogelman, Mary Halvorson, Scott James, Steve Kawa, Sandy Mayo, Marcelo Pimentel, Kay Powell, Julie Restivo, Alex Taber, Juan Vazquez, Melinda Womack

Mary McMullin served as the Moderator for the meeting in the absence of Mary Halvorson.

Items on the Agenda were:
A. Reports from the Four Standards,
B. Survey Discussion
C. Evidence Collection Process & Procedures
D. Dialogue as a Theme: How, When, Where?

Prior to the reports from the individual standard representatives, a brief discussion ensued regarding the process of collecting evidence in the Fall of 2003 and the Spring of 2004. By the end of Spring 2004, all standards should have their evidence and the answers to their standard questions collected in bullet form. The Summer of 2004 will be used to write the first draft of the evidence collected.

The Fall of 2004 will be used by the individual standards to analyze the written first draft and make corrections. This will be the time that collected evidence is analyzed to determine what is working and what is not working as well as it should.

The Spring of 2005 will be used to define concerns, issues, and prepare a planning agenda of items that need to be addressed.

A. Reports for Individual Standards

Standard I  Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Chairs: Tricia Evans, Marcelo Pimental, Robert Melendez
Reporting Member: Robert Melendez

This Standard Committee has been concentrating on the Mission Statement and Student Learning Outcomes. Robert distributed a copy of a tentative survey this committee has developed of items they need to determine.

A copy of the Meeting Notes from their January 26, 2003, meeting was distributed.
This committee questioned whether it was their responsibility to revise the current mission statement or merely learn others' opinion of it.

The committee suggested that they do a survey for students, faculty, community, and employees and business groups. A copy of their proposed survey for Students was distributed.

This led to an in-depth discussion of the survey: how many, who should prepare, etc.

**Survey Discussion**

The consensus of the group was that there should probably be only one survey, which will contain guidance and proposed questions from each standard. There may be exceptions, such as for the library, but the recommendation is not to overdo surveys with different groups. The suggestion was made that there be a meeting with all standards represented to brainstorm what the survey should contain so that each standard is given the chance to cover the questions they want to pose.

Mary Halvorson will be asked to schedule this type of meeting with Julie Slark and Nga Pham.

As for the Mission Statement, it is the consensus of the group that the revision of the mission statement should probably be a task for the following year and handled by a separate committee. This will be further discussed at the next Accreditation meeting.

Julie and Nga are happy to meet with individual standard committees to help them develop the necessary questions to go on a survey if one is needed and they have questions they want answered.

**Standard II A**

Chairs: Mary McMullin, Debbie Hjorth, Melinda Womack
Representatives Reporting: Mary McMullin and Debbie Hjorth

Committee has met, divided their evidence collecting into sub components, and identified individuals who will be responsible for various aspects of collecting. At their next meeting in March they will discuss the items collected and determine what is still needed.

**Standard II B Student Support Services**

Chairs: Ruth Babeshoff, Leonor Aguilera, and Betty Cotton
Representatives Reporting: Ruth Babeshoff, Leonor Aguilera, and Betty Cotton

This committee now has 13 members who have met, divided into sub-committees and determined who will collect evidence for each section. They have devised a grid for the committee members to use to document their evidence collection. They will send a copy to all Standard Chairs for their use.
The standard committee (IIB) questioned who should cover tutoring inasmuch as that is not a direct responsibility of Student Support Services. The Steering Committee assigned this task to Student Support Services.

This committee will meet to analyze their evidence collecting progress on Feb 26, 2004, and, at that time, will discuss how they will respond to the required themes.

**Standard II C Library and Learning Support Services**

Chairs:  Mary Halvorson, Barbara Sproat, Pat Fogelman  
Representative Reporting:  Barbara Sproat

Reported that the library is using their prepared forms and graphs to collect evidence, and are experiencing good dialogue about their progress and the needs of the library. They are meeting on a regular basis and are getting ready to integrate the themes into the evidence they have gathered.

They believe they need a separate survey to gather further evidence and should have their survey draft completed by the middle of March. This group is also considering conducting an informal Student Forum to brainstorm with students what the library is today and what it might be.

This led to a discussion of how the evidence should be labeled for easy reference and storage. It was noted that Linda Cucovatz is in charge of this area and will probably be using the same method that was incorporated during the last accreditation visit.

**Classifying and Storing Evidence**

Mary Halvorson will invite Linda to attend the next meeting of the Steering Committee on Friday, March 5, 2004 to discuss how Linda needs the evidence presented to her, what comes to the central area, and what is kept in the individual Standard collections, and how it should be numbered for exhibits.

At that time, there will also be further discussion of exactly what evidence is and how it should be maintained.

**Standard III- A Human Resources**

Chairs:  Sandy Mayo, Mike Parrella, Julie Restivo  
Representative Reporting:  Mike Parrella

This committee is preparing a list of interviewees and interview questions. The questions will be submitted to the steering committee for review and discussion before the interviews begin.
Standard III-B - Physical Resources

Chairs: Bruce Bromberg, Fran Cummings
Representative Reporting: Bruce Bromberg

Reported that the committee chairs had lost a member with the resignation of Jose Recinos. The committee is in the process of recruiting some additional members. Several names were suggested as possible members.

This committee is discussing the possibility of an informal student forum to gather student input on the facilities being formulated as well as the new Continuing Education Center and Anaheim Hills.

Standard III-C Technology Resources

Chairs: Ron Kessler, Kay Powell, Scott James
Representative Reporting:

No report given.

Standard III-D Financial Resources

Chairs: Steve Kawa, Alex Taber, Angel Brea
Representative Reporting: Angel Brea

This committee is interested in developing several questions to go on the survey regarding the budget and the faculty’s knowledge of how the budget is formed and administered as well as the logistics of ordering supplies.

They are also preparing a list of names to be interviewed.

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance

Chairs: Juan Vasquez, John Smith, Terry Wilksen
Representative Reporting: John Smith

The President is committed to active participation in the Accreditation and will take an active part in gathering the required board documents. In the spring, the committee expects to address evaluations. They are also preparing some survey questions for the chancellor and the Board of Trustees. This may be a separate survey.

Governance for this committee must reflect the emergence of a two college district.

The role of Jan Drinkgern was discussed.
Dialogue Discussion

Julie Slark led a discussion on how SCC is engaging in one of the major themes of the Accreditation: dialogue.

A number of topics were introduced as ways the college is currently engaging in dialogue. These included regularly scheduled meetings of classified, faculty, and administrators where up-to-date information is presented by the President as well as department meetings, the SLO committee, etc.

The following questions were posed:
How is SCC engaging in dialogue regarding SLO at this time?
What other methods could be used to ensure dialogue is college-wide, specifically on the subject of Student Learning Outcomes.

Suggestions given were the following:
Form a Student Learning Outcome Committee via CPAC
Include SLO dialogue in the program review committee
Have a faculty forum on SLO as part of flex week
Nurture participation so that everyone takes ownership for SLO
Develop questions that could be circulated college-wide for input
Survey faculty development, forums, meetings, and departments to determine what they are doing about SLO
Hold a training session to share information learned at the Mt Sac SLO workshop.
Ask Julie Slark to have a training for SCC personnel on SLO to increase awareness and understanding among staff and faculty.
Ensure that all courses going through quadrennial review include the student learning outcomes as part of the course outline
Begin the development of a training manual or SCC Handbook of SLO

Mary McMullin reported on the areas of SLO that would be included in the Title III grant if it is received. The question was posed if the items listed in this proposal could not be covered even if the grant was not received.

Suggestion was made that the idea of questions for college-wide discussion and input be addressed by the Committee of 4 at their next meeting. A report on suggested questions to be given at the March Steering Committee.

Minutes taken and prepared by Barbara Zunich.