

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
October 11, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Rachel Vickrey, D. Romo(SGA)

Absentees: Klint Rigby, Ann Morgan, Sue Granger-Dickson, Bernadette Towns, Bonnie Suderman, Billy Barnes Renee Trujillo, Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), and Diana Kelly.

1. Review and approve minutes - pending

2. Report on action items

- Jennifer Marden posted to SharePoint the College wide Committee Reports and broke down the tables
- Self Evaluation Editor has been named. Jennifer Jett, who is faculty from the English department who serve in the new position. (
- Survey will be ready by 5pm per Bonnie Suderman. Earlier there was a server issue that has now been resolved.

3. SEC Update

The question was asked that since planning agendas are already addressed in the midterm report; do committees need to still address them? Yes, per Kate Pluta and Rachel Vickery. LaMont Schiers said that the SEC is reviewing the entire document. Kirk Russell asked when the ASC will have time to write the actionable Improvement Plan. December 6th is when they will go to the editor. Kate Pluta suggested cleaning up the evidence that does not go into the main documents and use as supplemental evidence and have available to the survey team just in case they ask for more documentation. The suggestion was also made that all finished documents be in PDF. LaMont asked how the survey team will be able to access the supplemental evidence. Group will give it some thought. **(See Report to Accreditation Steering Committee handout for details)**

4. Integrated Program Review

A subgroup report given by Diana Kelly, Sue Granger-Dickson, Klint Rigby and Billy Barnes. No report at this time.

5. Planning – report from Academic Senate, College Council and Budget Committee

Per Kate Pluta the ASC is asking the Academic Senate, College Council, and the Budgeting Committee to discuss our college's planning process. Is our college planning integrated? Do we evaluate it? Senators discussed whether the BC planning process is reactive or proactive, or as some suggested, reactive to a problem, but then proactive later on in addressing the causes of the problem.

College Council also discussed reactive and proactive planning stated that both are needed. Plan as much as possible, but also be able to respond to unexpected threat and opportunities.

Budget Committee on the 10th of October discussed the links to committee goals 2, 6, and 7; focusing on establishing a timeline which allows for timely college review, input, modification and clear articulation processes for reviewing budget requests.

(See handout for detailed report)

6. Accreditation Liaison Officer training report

No report at this time. EVP will report by email or at next meeting.

7. Communication from ACCJC

At previous meeting, handout has given to ASC with the policies and procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems that was revised June 2011. Kirk Russell stated he had been reading through and covering how the process works.

8. Update on Program Review implementation

Hamid gave some feedback about program review documents coming into the Office of Academic Affairs. They were do last Friday. Most were submitted. Not sure if they will go to SharePoint. Ann Morgan will probably be able to discuss when she and Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg return from the Student Success Conference next week.

Adjourned- Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 25, 2011

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Levinson 40