



Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes

August 12, 2019 | 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. | 3134/N3213

Committee Description:

This is a district committee of representatives from various constituent campus groups that plans the process and timeline for Accreditation self-studies and maintains an annual record of accreditation standard progress reports. This committee develops templates, processes, and timelines for each of the standard committees and sub-committees; coordinates and conducts employee satisfaction surveys; reviews drafts prepared by each standard committee and various sub-committees; assists in the development and implementation of planning agendas; and assesses the institutional progress on addressing each standard.

Committee Initiatives:

ACCJC Standard(s)	In Progress	Complete	Timeline	Initiatives
				1) Facilitate the development of the 2020 institutional self-evaluation report.
				2) Educate and train the campus community on accreditation standards, policies, and practices
				3) Facilitate the ongoing integration of ACCJC accreditation standards into the work and processes of the San Luis Obispo Community College District
				4) Monitor compliance with ACCJC accreditation standards and policies, and any other external state and/or federal regulations

ACTION ITEMS	NOTES	FUTURE ACTION
Approval of agenda and April 15, 2019 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-Chairs introduced themselves. Updated the committee on the training provided to the Board members at the August BOT meeting. • May is the deadline to get the report ready to get it to the Commission in June. Jason is ALO. Kevin will assist with the ISER. <p>Approval of Agenda and Minutes - First: M. Medeiros Second: K. Stearns Motion passed unanimously</p>	
1. Orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handbook and manual are updated for 2019 and online. Some smaller edits may need to be made and they will be updated as that happens. • If writing to something in the ISER that has history, how do you present the process? Report what we are doing with it right now. It doesn't need the historical background. • Is there going to be an editor to work on the entire report? Has been discussed. Perhaps a small, focused writing team who will meet frequently. 	
2. Committee Initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee's role is to approve drafts as they go through Planning and Budget, Academic Senate, and College Council. Their feedback comes here for final consideration. Committee can choose to accept or reject feedback. Any rejected feedback must be given a reason. • When reading drafts, focus on content not formatting. • Important to stay aligned with the Committee Agenda Deadline Calendar. 	
3. Remediating Evidence for ADA Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cuesta needs to be in ADA compliance Web-wide, starting with the ISER. Legal issue. • Unsure of how long it will take to convert linked documents to make them ADA compliant. • When will it be determined which pieces will be the final evidence so they can be remediated? Once draft has been finalized by ASC, the evidence for that document will be considered final. • Better to remediate the specific pieces than the thousands that have been uploaded. • Expectation that evidence coming to ASC is correct? Not necessarily, if someone uploads a piece and attaches it not remediated, it has to be done. Remediating team would do the remediation to meet the timeline. • Who will name the team doing remediation? Start with people already appointed (Todd, Cindy, Melinda) and include more if the work demands it. 	

<p>4. Review Drafts Eligibility Requirements Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Commission Policies Standard 1A Standard III.A Standard IV.A Standard IV.B</p>	<p><u>ERs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question marks need to be addressed. Data/information needs to be integrated. • Suggest not to include evidence in this section. Will be presented in other areas of the report. <p><u>Certification of Commission Policies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence doesn't need to be presented in this section, either. • Some places, wording is choppy. Wording can affect content. Editor may not understand context the way some sentences are written. • Work with major committees to ensure content is the focus. <p><i>When other standards referenced, is that ok? Yes. Commission trying to streamline. Referencing is a way to lead a reader to a particular section. Also prevents repetition.</i></p> <p><u>Standard I.A</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a clean layout. A model for others working on their sections. • End of 1.A.1 says "The college meets Standard 1.A.1 and Eligibility Requirement 6." Make sure <i>District</i> is used, not <i>College</i>. <i>Does it need to go at the end of each substandard? Yes.</i> Should have consistency. • Where it has evidence in parentheses (evidence 1), how does that evidence get labeled? Will work on a system that organizes according to appearance in the report. • Needs analysis and evaluation paragraphs at the end of each substandard. <p><u>Standard IV.A</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs some work with evidence. • Consistency with name of the handbook. • Need clarification on names of some of the evidence. <p><u>Standard III.A</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.A.12 remove "Action" in Equity name. • 3.A.14 4th par. Change director of Equity and Student Success Centers • Analysis and Evaluation needs to be written for each substandard. <p><u>Standard IV.B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to locate particular pieces of evidence. <p>"This needs more added"—can link to another piece of evidence in 3.D that would work.</p>	
<p>7. Summary of Meeting and Action Taken</p>	<p>Next Meeting is Monday August 26, 2019 in Room 3134</p>	

