



Skyline College

Accreditation Oversight Committee
May 7, 2014

Draft Minutes

Attendance: Karen Wong, Joe Morello, John Mosby, Alana Utsumi, Sarita Santos, Joi Blake, Eloisa Briones, David Ulate

Absent: Sarah Perkins, Pricilla Sanchez, Nick Kapp, Bridget Fischer, Regina Stanback Stroud

1. Approve April minutes

Item was tabled until Fall 2014.

2. ACCJC Spring newsletter

David Ulate discussed with the committee that ACCJC has published their Spring 2014 newsletter. It is something that would be good for committee members to read and review. It will be discussed at the first AOC meeting next Fall 2014. Karen Wong mentioned that there is a lot of information about SLOs in the newsletter and David mentioned how there is a discussion on partnerships between ACCJC and member institutions, update on federal regulations, and update on accreditation outcomes.

3. Debrief on 2013 Self-Evaluation & Site Visit Experience

David Ulate mentioned that he had invited Donna Bestock and Christine Roumbanis to come and speak to this group about their experience as co-chairs of the Accreditation Steering Committee for the 2013 Self-Evaluation. They were unable to attend, but the idea was to learn from their experience as to what we could do to improve or practices and processes around accreditation moving forward.

Joe Morello mentioned how this time around, it felt more like we were starting from scratch in terms of the writing process. Looking at the previous self-evaluation for help in writing this one was not as helpful as people had originally thought. John Mosby mentioned how this self-evaluation gives us a good reference point on how to think about document accreditation work moving forward. We can look to what we have done in the past and compare it to what we have done now.

One idea is that if we still have four standards, it might be good to have a standing committee for each of the standards that meets at the end of each year. This would help formalize a structure of how standards teams meet continuously to discuss and perhaps draft narrative around each standard. The two chairs of each team could also reach out to different campus groups/areas/individuals to gather evidence and maybe contribute some narrative. Each team could also use a writer.

Sarita Santos mentioned how it is important to create a culture of accreditation evidence documentation, and this would help that.



4. Documentation strategies brainstorm

a. What should we document?

The committee discussed how trying to document everything the college does that is relative to every standard could be very overwhelming for people. Instead, direction could be given to provide evidence for some of the “big ticket” accreditation items that we know are of high importance to report on. This will make it more manageable for the college. Alana Utsumi discussed that a 1-2 page (max) document summarizing each standard and giving an idea of what those important items are would be very helpful. These sheets could be passed out to governance groups, division meetings, etc. to help foster documentation.

David Ulate mentioned that he would also like to see documented “new” things that people did at the college. That way if people don’t know with which standard it is necessarily associated with, this can be determined at a later time.

b. How should it be collected/documentated?

i. In particular with relation to the standards

John Mosby discussed how at SSLT meetings, there always was a portion of the meeting dedicated to accreditation standards and during the writing of the draft, the team read all the standards through a student services lens to provide necessary support to the writing of student service topics in all standards. This helped increase communication and collaboration, something we want to do moving forward. The committee then discussed how this demonstrates the benefit of all groups contributing to all standards.

John suggested that accreditation be a standing agenda item at all meetings, even if the item only took five minutes to discuss. It helps build it into our mindset and culture as something we always do. Joi Blake discussed the idea of having people identify the standard in which their agenda item is related—label the agenda item with the standard(s) to which it is related. This discussion item could then be moved into the accreditation evidence repository.

The accreditation evidence repository was discussed as a SharePoint site with folder for each standard (and possibly some sub-standards) where people can upload evidence and provide a very short narrative to describe the evidence and discuss its relationship to the standard. The repository would also include a template that people could fill out to document the evidence. The template (in a .pdf fillable form) would be very simple. It would have a place where people can say what the evidence is, to what standard is it related, and how it’s related to the standard. Karen Wong mentioned that people could just provide links to evidence documents but that in the fillable form they should also include the name of the linked document in case the link changes. Having examples of what to put in the repository will also help.

c. Who should provide evidence?

Anybody can provide evidence. The idea is to make it a process simple enough that it won't take much time/effort for somebody to complete. Joi Blake discussed the idea of providing an orientation on using the repository. Joe Morello discussed how if gathering evidence were decentralized, this makes it important to provide some training on how to provide evidence to make sure that people have the same understandings and are informed on current standards requirements.

Karen Wong discussed how team chairs could also seek out individuals with expertise and/or committees in certain areas to provide input and evidence for specific standards. Or to provide some support in drafting summary narrative around evidence collected.

d. Who should collect and “report” the evidence?

While anybody can provide evidence, standard team leaders (or “point people”) would take the lead on collecting and synthesizing the information. This could be done annually.

The committee also discussed doing some type of accreditation update every semester as a way to give an overall update to the campus. This could be done through open forums and/or online video reports.

e. What should we continually do with the evidence? (if anything)

- i. Should we write some type of summary (or summaries) of evidence submitted?**
- ii. Should we organize it at the end of every year so that it is much more “accessible” to writers at the time of the self-evaluation?**

The evidence should continually be discussed. Having a writer on each team would allow end of the year summaries to be written in one voice.

Joe Morello discussed that if next visit is in Fall of 2019, it would be helpful for the writing process to being in the Fall of 2007 and work to have a first draft by end of Spring 2018. Joi Blake talked about building a timeline to outline now to outline the process. The committee then discussed the idea of creating a timeline now that outlined not only the process for writing the next self-evaluation, but also the processes of meeting all accreditation requirements such as annual reports, the mid-term report, etc.

David Ulate discussed that this would be good for the AOC to do at the first meeting in the Fall—to draft a timeline (that could then go through participatory governance), begin recruiting individuals for standards teams, and begin drafting 1-2 pagers for each standard.



Skyline College

Accreditation Oversight Committee
May 7, 2014

5. AOC in 2014/15 – (5 minutes)
 - a. Membership
 - b. Meeting time/location

David Ulate discussed that membership should be the same come next. Since this committee was newly formed and today was only the 2nd meeting, he assumes that those presently on the committee would continue their participation next year. But he will confirm that with constituency group leaders.

As for meeting time and location, the possibility of taking the time slot previously occupied by IPC (2nd Wednesday of every month from 2-4) was discussed but there has been no formal decision. David will keep members informed on any developments.