



Skyline College

Accreditation Oversight Committee

April 7, 2014

Draft Minutes

Attendance: Joi Blake, Sarah Perkins, Alana Utsumi, Karen Wong, John Mosby, Joe Morello, Sarita Santos, Pricilla Sanchez, David Ulate

Absent: Eloisa Briones, Bridget Fischer, Nick Kapp, Regina Stanback Stroud

1. Welcome

- a. Introductions?
- b. Next meeting and meetings for next year
- c. Charge (from Compendium of Committees)

David Ulate discussed meeting next month. A poll will be sent out to determine where and when the meeting will be. Next year it will be a set day and time every month.

David Ulate reviewed the charge of the committee as is described in the compendium of committees. Sarah Perkins provided background/context to how the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC) came from. The committee discussed how one of its responsibilities is to keep up with changes in accreditation requirements and help keep the entire institution involved in meeting requirements. It is a shared responsibility.

2. Review ACCJC website

The committee reviewed the ACCJC website and discussed information and resources located throughout the site. Sarah Perkins discussed how other accreditation agencies (e.g. Higher Learning Commission) organize their website as a way to understand the different ways information support is provided. The AOC discussed how to use ACCJC's website to stay abreast to changes in requirements.

3. Review reaffirmation letter

The committee discussed the accreditation reaffirmation letter and the deficiency and recommendations articulated therein. It was discussed that the one deficiency needs to be resolved by October 15, 2014 while the two college recommendations are to be resolved by the midterm report. Sarah Perkins spoke to the deficiency and how the College has already addressed it and come into full compliance. Processes have been put into place and practices implemented to standardize the evaluation process. A process is in place for deans to upload and update data on who was evaluated and who will be evaluated. By November 2013, the College was already at 91 percent compliance and is now in full compliance. By the time we submit our report (Fall 2014), we will have two semesters to demonstrate full compliance and evidence that a sustainable process is in place.

For recommendation #2, David Ulate talked about how he (as chair of the Institutional Planning Committee), Eloisa Briones and Leigh Anne Shaw (as co-chairs of the College Budget Committee) will discuss strategies



Skyline College

Accreditation Oversight Committee

April 7, 2014

this summer and/or fall to address this recommendation. These strategies will then be brought back to the AOC for their consideration and review. It was discussed that this could also serve as an opportunity to revisit the process as a whole and, in particular, how it is described in our manuals and understood by the college.

For recommendation #3, Sarah Perkins discussed how through the use of right of assignment, the College will be in 100% compliance with regular and substantive interaction by fall 2014. A process is currently being developed to bring everybody into compliance. This process needs to be documented. Sarita Santos asked about “substantive contact”. Sarah Perkins explained that this is a federal regulation and is described in our Distance Education handbook.

The committee briefly reviewed the district recommendations and discussed how the College’s role with these is to support the district in whatever it needs to come into full compliance.

4. 2014 ACCJC Annual Report

The 2014 ACCJC Annual report was reviewed and discussed. David Ulate mentioned how in the past, the report was based primarily on quantitative data while now there are some qualitative questions. On the quantitative data, David discussed how it is common practice for institutions to set standards based on a five year average and that has been Skyline College’s practice, in general, and is what is reflected in the report. The transfer data reflects that of UC and CSU transfers since that is the data most readily available (and current). Joe Morello mentioned how changes in transfer policies and practices can impact these numbers and how students may look to private colleges/universities as a result of the policy/practice changes. Consequently, it would be good to also have data on transfer to private four-year institutions.

For the qualitative report items, Karen Wong discussed how she collaborated with many different committees and constituency groups to get feedback. This feedback was then synthesized and drafted for the report. It was a bit of a challenging process given the character limit constraints of the report.

5. Proposed new ACCJC standards

A general discussion was held regarding the proposed new ACCJC standards. David Ulate had sent, prior to the meeting, documents for committee members to review. From this, committee members were given a sense of what the differences were between the current standards and the proposed new standards. In looking at those differences, one point of discussion mentioned was the need to eliminate repetition and over prescription. Karen Wong specifically identified standard IIIA6 and discussed how assessment was tied to the evaluation of faculty. A need for clarification was discussed in addition to possible changes to the standard. The committee also discussed how “administrators” was added to this standard and how this too needed to be clarified. It was unclear how administrators were “directly responsible for student learning” and thus how they can/should be evaluated.

Joe Morello discussed how athletics is mentioned in the proposed standards. In particular he discussed standard IIB4 and the relationship between co-curricular and athletics programs. Joe discussed the need for clarification.



Skyline College

Accreditation Oversight Committee

April 7, 2014

Finally, it was agreed upon by the committee that feedback on the new standards was to be emailed to David Ulate by April 21 where he will subsequently put the feedback together and submit to ACCJC. If clarification is needed *prior to* providing feedback, members are to email David and he will ask ACCJC for clarification.