**Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting**  
Tuesday, September 15, 2015  
Well 321, 3-5 PM  

**MINUTES (DRAFT)**

**Members Present:** Kristin Charles (Co-Chair), Lillian Marrujo-Duck (Co-Chair), Kristina Whalen, Andrea Niosi, Aaron Holmberg; **Alternate Present:** Judy Seto

**Workgroup Co-Chairs:** Jeff Lamb, Ray Gamba, Carl Jew, Mark Zacovic, Sheri Miraglia, Lidia Jenkins, Pam Mery, Steve Bruckman, Wendy Kaufmyn, Chris Kox, Geisce Ly, Donna Hayes, Karen Saginor, Anna Davies, Chris Kox

**Members Absent:** Doug Re, Tim Ryan, Austin Smith, Bridgid Skiba; **Alternates Absent:** Athena Steff, Edissa Nicolas, Sandra Vaughn

**Guests:** Katryn Wiese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Discussion/Outcome</th>
<th>Follow Up/Individual Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | Approval of Minutes | - September 1st notes are posted on the Accreditation website.  
- Please submit any edits to Judy unless there are burning items we need to discuss as a group.  
- All Standing Committees now follow a new format for notes/minutes and agendas.  
- The Committee recommended adding follow up items from each meeting to the subsequent agenda.  
- Steve has not received any requests for developing/refining policies required to meet the Standards after the last Steering Committee meeting aside from the ones discussed offline.  
- We need to update the membership list; in some cases, new appointments are needed. | Judy will make edits if there are any and put any follow up items to the next agenda.  
Judy/Kristin will check with Jill in updating the classified staff membership list. |
| 2.  | Standing Committees Evaluation Survey Results | - PGC did an internal and external evaluation for two years and this time it included the Standing Committee evaluation.  
- The Accreditation Standing Committee received a larger number of responses (16) compared to the other Standing Committees.  
- Respondents = 11 members/alternates, 5 regular attendees  
- Ten indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” that agendas were provided prior to committee meetings. Five felt similarly about meeting notes although 11 indicated that they “Neither Agree nor Disagree” or “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree.” The Chair’s goal is 100%. Note: Most of the notes missing were prior to May 2015, after which there was a change in leadership of the Committee (as of July 1). |  |
- A few meetings are missing minutes. We will check on the previous meetings to see if we can find or come up with the notes that are missing.
- Committee members felt in general the notes/minutes were improved especially with the improvement of the new minutes’ structure that incorporates responsibility/accountability.
- Concerns included the narrowness of the meeting structure, “Recommendations were rarely made,” and “it’s not always clear what decision needed to be made.” The Committee needs to discuss actual issues.
- Classified staff expressed that it’s difficult to participate because of their workload or type of work. We may need to work with supervisors to identify how to make attendance possible. We will check with Athena and Jill to see how we can best support classified participation. A member suggested to ask Athena to send out an email to their supervisors. The Co-Chairs’ goal is to improve the functionality of the Committee as a whole.
- Students also expressed that it’s challenging for them to participate due to time, work, family, and comfort. We have tried in many ways to reach out to students and we have evidence to that effect, yet students still have not participated at a significant level. Discussed possibly reinstating stipends for students, cafeteria vouchers, or book vouchers. We will request help from Nessa Julian.
- Received positive feedback regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of this committee. Members find it useful to go through the Standards presentation process to highlight and discuss findings from the Standards workgroups. We have put workgroup presentations on hold but need to consider resurrecting them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Quality Focus Essay (QFE)</th>
<th>Next steps for the Quality Focus Essay:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obtain feedback on the selected topic from constituent groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Steering Committee will make the decision on the topics then bring to the PGC for information and discussion only. Lillian will share with the Academic Senate Council on the QFE topics along with the QFE Guidelines and Criteria from ACCJC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Steering Committee recommended that we choose a topic that highlights success and promotes continuation of growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- We chose to explore a focus on the topic of the new and improved outcomes assessment and program review processes that provide great disaggregation of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Answers to Question 4 related to SLOs in program review vary. Some responses are too short and don’t directly answer the question. Program reviews are based on data and we have always been pushing on that direction, but more emphasis and support is needed. To facilitate this emphasis, this year’s program review guidelines identify specific data that must be analyzed with a provision that analysis of additional data is optional. This is a departure from previous years when massive spreadsheets were provided. To improve the quality of data analysis in program review, we need collaboration and sincere effort college wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kristin will research whether previous meeting minutes are available to post online.

Kristin will follow up with Nessa and Samuel on student participation.

Kristin will follow up with the Chancellor about the Board presentations of the Standards.

Kristin needs to be at the next Department Chairs meeting to get everyone on board.

Kristin will prepare a sheet regarding what needs to be in program review that refers to which standards.

Kristin/Lillian will send QFE topic on disaggregated outcome assessment to constituents for feedback.
4. Accreditation Support and Accountability Taskforce (ASAT)

- The QFE needs to be written by April 18, 2016.
- The first meeting of ASAT will be on Friday, September 18. Lillian has sent an email to the ASAT group asking them to read through the entire set of Standards Deep Outlines and pay attention to areas within their expertise in preparation for the meeting. We will report out of our findings on the next Steering Committee meeting.
- The ASAT members are: Kristin Charles, Lillian Marrujo-Duck, Susan Lamb, Anna Davies, Lisa Romano, Cynthia Dewar, Andrea Niosi, Dana Labrecque, and Jill Kersey.

5. Report on responses from ACCJC to outstanding items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most of the questions we submitted to ACCJC required us to answer them ourselves except for two.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Page 21 of the Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation, Section I. The restoration visiting team was directed to not to give us recommendations. After consulting with Krista Johns, ACCJC’s response is that we’re not expected to provide Section I but they added 2 additional sections to Section I which CCSF will need to provide a short response. A markup to Krista Johns will remind people what we said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Standard IC14 - it seems directed for for-profit institutions and not community colleges. Cases like supporting external business through pressure and interest will fall in to this standard. Take PE for example, access to facility (student vs. outside community). To help solve this issue, on the facility request form, we should embed a question to the form, “How does this request link to the mission of our college?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commission Policy: Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement: If we didn’t meet one out of the two policies and we were told that we met the standard, how will that be viewed in our next accreditation review? We will have to decide internally by the College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ACCJC Policy: Distance Education and Correspondence Education: Institutions are expected to provide the Commission advance notice of intent to offer a program, degree or certificate in which more than 50% of the courses are via distance education or correspondence education, through the substantive change process. We need ACCJC to clarify what was included via the 2014 comprehensive review were accepted. The answer from ACCJC is that any course of studies recognized by the California Community Colleges State Chancellor’s Office on degree and certificates are accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Substantive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distance Education – Any programs offer more than 50%, it’s a substantive change, even in different location with more than 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change of Location – We did a substantive change to move Southeast Center to Evans but that didn’t happen and we relocated Civic Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Control of the Institution – Any time when the College has a change of CEO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASAT will review the entire set of Deep Outlines on 9/18 and report findings back to the Steering Committee at next meeting.

Kristin will send a confirmation email to Krista Johns and get a confirmation from ACCJC.

Judy will add Standard IC14 for discussion on the next agenda item.

Kristin will check on the substantive change related to Civic Center.
We still have a series of sanctions pending. We should send a letter to the Commission and indicate the case. It needs to be sent by March – April 2016.

6. How far away library services impact students? We can answer this question by adding a question to the satisfactory survey, “Did you use this service to help you with other classes?”


**Future Meetings**
- October 6, 20: 3-5PM, WELL 321
- November 3, 17: 3-5PM, WELL 321
- December 1, 15: 3-5PM, WELL 321

Minutes taken by Judy Seto.