



ELAC ACCREDITATION 2015

Looking Back, Moving Forward

ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING

Friday, September 13, 2013

10:00AM – 11:30AM - G1-301AB

Attendees: Dr. Barbara Dunsheath, Dr. Ryan Cornner, Dr. Richard Moyer, Evelyn Escatiola, Tom Furukawa, Chris Garcia, Michelle Hernandez-Payan, Lindy Fong, Danelle Fallert, Dr. Carol Kozeracki, Brenda Baity, Alex Immerblum, Laura E. Ramirez, Kerrin McMahon, Armando Rivera-Figueroa

- I. Meeting called to order 10:12 by B. Dunsheath
- II. Adoption of agenda (m. L.M Ramirez/ 2nd B. Baity)
- III. Review of Member list/Clarification of Accreditation Committee and Steering Committee.
 - a. **Steering Committee** are the team leaders – one administrator, one faculty for each of the four standards and major sub-standards. These people are those in Bold on the handout. The goal of the steering committee is to coordinate the accreditation self-study. The Steering committee will meet on Fridays @9:00.:
Oct. 18; Nov. 22; Dec 13* tentative for Fall, 2013.
 - b. **Accreditation Committee** (Formerly called ARG) will meet on the Third Tuesday of each month @ 12:15-1:45
Sept. 17; Oct. 15; Nov. 19; Dec. 17
The goal of this committee is to involve the overall campus community in the accreditation self-study and provide feedback in general regarding the accreditation cycle.
 - c. **Standard Committee** Each of the standards should meet to gather evidence and write the self-study. Meetings set by standard co-chairs.
- IV. Review of Member List:
 - a. Students need to be recruited for each of the standards.
 - b. Some people are listed on more than one standard. They should choose which standard they want to be actively involved in, but due to their multiple roles on campus, they need to understand that their expertise will be relied upon for more than one standard in the self-study.
- V. Faculty Survey:

This had been reviewed at our August 23rd meeting. The OIE needs to implement the agreed upon changes and send out by end of September in order to collect data that cannot be obtained in other areas.
- VI. Review of Highlights of 2009 Self-evaluation report and recommendations
B. Dunsheath distributed a summary of the 2009 visiting team report. She emphasized the importance of not receiving similar recommendations by visiting teams. While the majority of the 2009 recommendations regarding the mission statement, program review, and shared governance handbook have made significance progress, the SLO

process remains below the required ACCJC standards and has been a recommendation in 2003 and 2009.

VII. An open discussion listing major changes at ELAC since 2009 provided the following feedback:

- Changes in Personnel
 - New, Permanent President
 - A permanent faculty member has been hired as a Learning Assessment Coordinator
 - Faculty Hiring
 - New Faculty Institute
- New Policies:
 - New Program Review Process
 - New Program viability Process
 - Revised Hiring Policy
 - Enrollment Management
- Curriculum
 - courses updated
 - Distinction between Distance Ed and correspondence courses (not fully completed)
 - Response to SB 1456 (repeatability) and SB 1440 Student Success
 - AA-T Degrees
- Student Services Modernization of services.
 - Growth in the award of scholarships
 - First Year Completion, Achieving the Dream
 - Welcome days
- Ongoing construction
 - Moratorium
 - Impact Facilities Master Plan
 - Impacts Facility Master Plan
 - Firestone site not secured
 - Corporate Center
- Misc.
 - Faculty Advising – for transfer; Faculty mentor program (not completely new)
 - Vincent Price shows
 - Grants

VIII. Review of Opening day session

- a. Preliminary feedback indicates that some people voiced concern that Accreditation was sugar-coated.
- b. B. Dunsheath offered the suggestion of having a campus-wide discussion regarding the Accreditation process, something like “Tell us what you really think about Accreditation” so that the under current of resistance could be discussed and addressed openly.
 - A lengthy discussion ensued around three main themes:

- There needs to be campus-wide buy into the accreditation process in order for it to be effective.
 - The true issue as a campus is that we allow people to disparage. This has a negative repercussion that cuts across all levels and needs to be addressed as an ethics concern for ELAC as a campus to be productive.
 - Ongoing professional development and communication about the purpose of the Accreditation process should help to demystify some of the concern.
 - B. Dunsheath encouraged all team members to be active supporters of the Accreditation process.
- IX. A review of resources was provided:
- a. Binders were distributed
 - b. Share point was briefly presented
 - c. ACCJC manuals were introduced.

Meeting adjourned 12:00.