

**Accreditation Leads Meeting: 27 November 2017  
(1:00 p.m. – 2:00 pm; HR Conference Room)**

**In attendance:**

**J. Cifra (BCC); D. Richardson, R. Bailey (Laney); A. Dambrosio (District)  
J. Lamb (Merritt) joined later in meeting via speaker phone.**

**1. Laney/Merritt/District ACCJC Team Visit: Observations**

The ACCJC Team Visits in October appeared to go well, but as we know, we cannot be certain of outcomes until formal letter is received (probably early February 2018).

**2. College AIPs:**

ANY AIP that still needs attention/collaboration with District, Please act now: Contact is usually Vice Chancellor and copy Chancellor's Executive Assistant –OR- Call -OR- Make an appt. to meet with District contact, etc.

Laney needs: —HR list of new hires to be confirmed with Laney; Dambrosio advised contacting V.C. Largent, if questions. Richardson inquired if District can assist with data analysis for Laney. Yes, contact VC Williams for Fiscal data, as needed.

Merritt needs: Internal data trend analysis: Fiscal data was done by David Yang.

BCC did data analysis in house and ignored "stretch."

**3. Midterm Reports discussion included the following:**

- Use current ACCJC Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission (no need to print Midterm Reports; electronic submission is all that is necessary. Lamb questioned need for flash drive, but Guidelines state that electronic submission is all that is necessary.
- Brevity of Reports is necessary (data/analysis format: Dambrosio sent copies of COA draft to all and Jason forwarded BCC's Midterm Report draft to all. Laney continues to revise its Midterm Report and should have draft ready by early December. Lamb stated that he would forward Merritt's draft as soon as possible—early December for sure. Dambrosio reminded the group that Midterm Reports should have some commonality in format which is why she had suggested that the Colleges review Palo Verde/Mission as two examples. She emphasized that the Colleges do not have to be "alike," but formats should be similar.
- Evidence (Methodology: See suggestions from College letters: Aug. 2017)  
Folder names should not be more than four characters in length

File names must not be more than 27 characters in length  
Avoid complex or redundant sub folder structures  
Develop standardized abbreviations for file naming conventions  
Use a hyperlink within the Report that will automatically take the reader to the evidence document –see paragraph on “separate folder”  
If one piece of evidence is used more than once, only need to include document in the first citation, then reference that first citation later on.  
Large evidence documents should not be used (use pertinent segments only and highlight pertinent segments, if needed).  
Be sure to include an Acronym list

#### **4. District Accreditation calendar:**

The District Accreditation calendar (posted online) does not specify the February Board meeting to approve Midterm Reports as 2018 calendar has not yet been adopted, but plan for February meeting.

Governing Board will establish 2018 Board meeting calendar at their December 2017 meeting; **at this time, we can establish the February Board meeting that will serve as the meeting to present the College Midterm Reports.**

#### **5. New Governing Board protocol for placing an item on the Board agenda:**

Dambrosio reported that she attended the Vice Chancellor meeting today wherein Brenda Martinez explained the new protocol for requesting that an item be placed on the Board agenda: Item must be submitted to Brenda via Board Docs two weeks prior to the Board meeting and supporting documentation must be included. One week prior to the Governing Board meeting, there is a mandatory meeting for all who will be presenting their agenda item(s). The meeting is held on Monday and all who intend to present an item must attend the meeting.

Dambrosio assumes that all four College Presidents will be presenting the Midterm Reports on the same evening in February to the Governing Board.

**Midterm Reports are due to the ACCJC March 15, 2018.**

#### **6. Next meeting: Friday, Feb. 2, 11:00 a.m. in the HR Conference Room (District)**

**FYI: The ACCJC Commission meets Jan. 10-12, 2018 to review Reports.**

**NOTE: SINCE THIS LEADS' MEETING, LANEY HAS FORWARDED ITS DRAFT MIDTERM REPORT. STILL AWAITING RECEIPT OF MERRITT MIDTERM REPORT.**

## ACCREDITATION LEADS' MEETING NOTES

22 June 2017

Human Resource Conference Room, 8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

J. Lamb (Merritt) T. Vasconcellos (COA); T. Vo-Kumamoto (BCC);  
D. Richardson, R. Bailey (Laney); A. Dambrosio (District)

**In attendance:** J. Lamb (first half); D. Richardson, R. Bailey (Laney), Dambrosio (District)

**No one from BCC and COA was in attendance.**

### Merritt:

AFR First draft completed..... Focused on course level work, but we put ourselves in “a box” with 100%.....we had not been focused on Program Level Outcomes, but we have done work over the summer. A few faculty will not do SLOs, although the need to do so is stated in self-evaluation.

### Laney:

Follow-Up Report is going well. All constituent groups were pleased with May draft.

Group discussed various ideas for assisting faculty to complete SLO work, to include “hands on” sessions. Discussion acknowledged the need to make SLO work meaningful, i.e., what actions are taken to improve student learning when outcomes are assessed. We need evidence of outcomes.

All discussed the need for Colleges and District to post current organization charts. Frustration was expressed that without current organization chart information, it is difficult to write Reports. Knowing “who is who,” for example will help to inform Report Writing. Also, the request to have Directories with telephone numbers, etc. would be very useful. When we need information, we often have no idea as to who to contact.

Both Laney and Merritt requested that Dambrosio would review final draft of Follow-Up Reports and make suggestions. Request was that both Colleges send drafts as soon as possible to allow adequate time for additional editing and inclusion of evidence.

Midterm Reports are focused on AIPs. If AIPs are not complete, then explanation is needed, to include timelines/person(s) responsible. Colleges will confer with District, as needed.

Suggestion for next meeting to be during the first week of August.

## **Accreditation Leads Minutes (HR Conference Room 9-10 am)**

**3-30-17**

**In attendance: J. Lamb (Merritt); Denise Richardson, John Yu (Laney);  
Tram Vo-Kumamoto (BCC); Annette Dambrosio (District)**

Lamb comment: The Teams will use the Functional maps as a roadmap for our Visits.

Tram.....the District does the FON but—in her view-- not given back to Colleges in a timely manner.....Let's say we hit our FON, but District can allocate additional funding.....We need more than “blessing our lists” and we need more communication. Dambrosio recommended more involvement in BAM reform.

John Yu.....It might be that our own internal processes need review and evaluation. We must work with the District.

Tram asks about AIPs.....District vs. College.....Dambrosio emphasizes that Colleges must collaborate with the District regarding any AIPs that need assistance from the District, e.g., Facilities, BAM, et.

Dambrosio asks if the Colleges have uniform criteria for planning and budgeting? She thinks that much can be learned if Colleges share what they do well with one another.

Again, Dambrosio wants all Leads to please send AIPs so we can examine them as a group.

Next meeting: May 2017? Date needs to be determined. Dambrosio will send an invite. May is a busy month.



**ACCREDITATION LEADS' MEETING MINUTES**  
**November 15, 2016 Human Resource Conference Room, 9-10 a.m.**  
**(2 pages total)**

**In attendance: M. Kelly (Merritt); T. Karas (COA); D. Richardson (Laney);  
A. Dambrosio (District); T Vo-Kumamoto (BCC); J. Yu  
Unable to attend: R. Bailey (Laney); J. Lamb (Merritt)**

1.) De-brief: Observations regarding ACCJC Team Visits

Merritt: (5 of 10 Team members were the same as the previous visit). The Team commented that the Report was well written.... Affirming work we had done. "I am encouraged." (Mia Kelly). Good chance of reaffirmation. Request for cycles of evaluations for classified. Many questions pertained to relations with the District went well (Open Forum).

COA: 5-member Team (one new person). Many of the meetings planned were cancelled, but "we saw that as a good thing" (Tim Karas). Team asked for update of Classified evaluations, but it seemed that approximately 75% were "riddled with errors." Might be systematic...perhaps there might not be a link in District for Classifieds.....faculty and management seemed o.k. Question: Is logging procedure in need of review in the District? Luckily, COA President kept a copy of evaluations and Karas was able to supply correct information to the Team. Dambrosio will look into evaluation concern with V.C. Largent so problem does not occur again. Many questions pertained to relations with the District went well (Open Forum). Karas also "repackaged" an example of planning process which helped the Team to understand the structure.

Laney: 4-member Team (one was new and Chair was the same as the District). Denise Richardson: Applauded us for "doing the work." We answered all of their questions. John Yu: They wanted to talk to assessment group and administrative group. Open Forum was held and the Team was organized. The day went well.

BCC: 4-member Team (same as last time). Tram Vo-Kumamoto: questions mainly pertained to the District. Also asked for our Tech plan, although not one of our recommendations. How is information fed to the District (some District questions were not expected). Team was "ecstatic" about how our evidence was structured. District section that reviewed Board policies was unexpected. Can we really review all of those policies? Dambrosio pointed out that calendar was a guideline for reviewing series of policies systematically.

District: The visit appeared to go well. The Team visited from approximately 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. (ten-member Team, and two who served on our previous Team visit). The Team asked for some supplemental documents and the District was able to provide all documentation requested. District employees were available and prepared.

2.) Moving forward: Planning for Midterm Report (due March 2018 to ACCJC)

- We need confirmation of College Leads for Midterm Report
- Dambrosio will put together a District Calendar similar to last year's and will work closely with Accreditation Leads. She is available to assist Colleges, as needed.
- Ongoing Recommendations? ACCJC can ask for focus report. They can also ask for Follow-Up Report in 6 months.
- Midterm Reports address all the improvement plans and eligibility standards, in addition to any Recommendations.

3.) Budget for Accreditation Work:

The Accreditation Leads addressed once again the need for resources—specifically, District financial support for Accreditation for each College. Discussion centered on: Will the District allocate funds to each College? If so, how will the funds be distributed? Should each College get an equal allocation? We have 5 budgets (4 Colleges and the District). College requests range from, for example: need for editors, staff who can do formatting, printing budget, pay for Committee work, pay for Coordinators. How will the District help to defray costs for the Colleges?

NOTE: The Chancellor was scheduled to attend this meeting, but scheduling conflicts prevented him from doing so. Dambrosio will forward these minutes to the Chancellor, so he can review budget concerns.

Next meeting is December 13, 9:00 – 10:00 a.m. HR Conference Room.

**ACCREDITATION LEADS' MEETING MINUTES**  
**October 4, 2016 Human Resource Conference Room, 9-10 a.m.**  
**(1 page total)**

**In attendance: M. Kelly (Merritt); T. Karas (COA); J. Yu, D. Richardson (Laney);  
A. Dambrosio (District); T Vo-Kumamoto (BCC)**  
**Unable to attend: R. Bailey (Laney); J. Lamb (Merritt)**

1.) Debrief: Reports and District responses

Thanks to T. Karas for delivering all 4 College Reports to the Commission office; all materials appeared to be in order (no additional requests were made).

To date, Colleges have not heard from ACCJC Team regarding visits. In the meantime, we should continue to collect evidence and have it ready for Team visits. In particular, meeting minutes and ongoing evaluations should be available.

We should print large Reports as reference documents. No need to give passcodes to Visiting Teams as we should volunteer to print any documents/reports needed, particularly as regards systems such as Task Stream, People Soft. We can explain that our systems require in-house knowledge and we are happy to pull any information that is needed for the Teams.

Leads agreed that we should continue to comb our Websites to better organize all materials, archive older documents, repair dead links, etc.

2.) Moving forward: Plan for Midterm Reports

Leads will begin making plans to assemble Midterm Reports following Team visits. Leads' meetings will continue to ensure coordination of Midterm Reports among all Colleges and the District.

3.) Other

Concern was expressed that Accreditation budgets should be available at each College and should be equitable. Questions: 1.) Should the District contribute to the Colleges' accreditation budget? 2.) Are there, in fact, line item accreditation budgets for each College? 3.) If so, who is in charge of these budgets? The Leads again expressed interest in discussing Accreditation budgets with the Chancellor.

Dambrosio suggested that the Chancellor be invited to attend the next meeting of the Accreditation Leads, if his schedule permits.

**Meeting adjourned at 10:00 am. Next meeting: Tuesday, 11-15-16 ( 9-10 am at HR Conference Room)**



