



Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 6, 2024

3-5 PM, Virtual Meeting

<https://ccsf-edu.zoom.us/j/83897030018>

MINUTES

Members Present: Kristin Charles (Co-Chair), Sheri Miraglia (Co-Chair), Cynthia Dewar, Stephanie Chenard, Andrea Niosi;

Alternates Present: Madeline Mueller, Judy Seto

Members Absent: Steven Brown, Michael Snider, Shang Xu

Alternate Absent: Amy Coffey, Lidia Jenkins, Joseph Reyes, Maria Salazar-Colon

Guest: Maureen Harrington

No.	Item	Discussion/Outcome	Follow Up/ Individual Responsible
1.	Review and approve December 5th Minutes (Action)	December 5 th minutes moved by Cynthia, seconded by Andrea Niosi, approved by committee with no abstentions.	
2.	Public Comments	None	
3.	Accreditation Steering Committee Membership <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students• Classified Staff	Classified Staff – We need one more Classified Staff member – Judy will reach out to Michael Snider to see if there are any new members. Students – Anita White was thinking about joining but her unit load might raise a concern about her membership validation. Kristin will check with Student Chancellor Malinalli for student members.	Judy will reach out to Michael regarding classified staff membership. Kristin will reach out to Malinalli for student membership.

4.	<p>Follow-up items from last meeting (Discussion):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on proposed BP/AP review process • Update on storage of syllabi/SLOs (ensuring that all faculty are using Canvas to store syllabi) 	<p>Update on proposed BP/AP review process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had acknowledged our challenge in keeping up the review of our BPs/APs in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report but the Team Report didn't include it as a compliance or improvement recommendation. The Team did encourage us to continue with the review process. • Kristin suggested doing an update on the BP/AP review process once at the end of each semester at the Accreditation Steering Committee meeting. • Kristin is coordinating with the Board to review the board policies given that it's one of the compliance recommendations that we need to meet. <p>Update on storage of syllabi/SLOs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty think it's easier with Simple Syllabus but some don't want to do it since it's not in the faculty contract. • Simple Syllabus is student centered and we should do it for the students. It is a nice tool that has many effective uses from different angles, and we should focus on the positive side of using it. • Jen Kienzle will talk to the Academic Senate on the upcoming updates of Simple Syllabus. • We should clarify with department chairs when faculty need to have their syllabi put into Simple Syllabus. • We need to update the Faculty Handbook to indicate that Simple Syllabus is the repository for syllabi. Sheri will need help from HR. Kristin and Sheri will work on this issue. 	Kristin and Sheri will be in contact on getting HR to update the Faculty Handbook with Simple Syllabus.
5.	<p>Accreditation Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 2024 Commission Actions on Institutions • January 2024 ACCJC Action letter and Team Report • Identify all areas noted for improvement / "suggestions" (beyond Compliance & Improvement Recommendations) • Next Steps / Follow-Up Report Template Accreditation Handbook (all-in-one) 	<p>Accreditation Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 2024 Commission Actions on Institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The Commission reaffirmed the accreditation of 9 colleges for 7 years on the basis of a comprehensive review. ✓ Butte and Palomar Colleges were reaffirmed for the remainder of the cycle on the basis of a follow-up report; Rio Hondo College was also reaffirmed but with a visit. ✓ The Commission deferred action for Santa Rosa Junior College; they are required to submit a follow-up report in 12 months. ✓ The mid-term reports of several colleges were accepted. ✓ The Commission reaffirmed the accreditation of 	Kristin/Sheri/Judy will put together an initial run of the suggestions from the Team Report so we can monitor them.

		<p>Moorpark, Oxnard, and Ventura Colleges for 18 months and with a follow-up report and visit. These colleges have findings related to the Board delegating authority to the Chancellor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Each college's Commission Action letter and Team Report are available on their respective accreditation web pages since they're required to post this information (ACCJC only posts the action letters). ● CCSF January 2024 ACCJC Action Letter and Team Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ CCSF has been issued a warning for not meeting three standards related to our Board of Trustees. ✓ We're required to submit a follow-up report by March 1, 2025, followed by a visit from a peer review team. ✓ We are still accredited during the warning period. ✓ We met 116 standards out of 119. ✓ The three standards that we didn't meet: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Standard III.D.11 – In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires the Governing Board consider the College's long-range fiscal implications when making financial decisions in order to assure financial stability. 2) Standard IV.C.7 – In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the Governing Board act in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. 3) Standard IV.C.12 – In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires that the Governing Board allow the Chancellor to implement and administer Board policies without Board interference. ✓ We have a number of challenges related to the three areas of noncompliance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Our reserve is 5-9% outlined in BP 8.01 but the State Chancellor's Office has recently raised the recommended district minimum reserve to 2 months of general fund expenditures which is about 15%. It will be challenging to that level in a one-year time frame. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Leadership turnover in the college (noted as a suggestion in the Team Report and related to fiscal health) ✓ The Board will need to decide how they want to address the above issues. ✓ Kristin suggested to the Board that they establish an ad hoc workgroup. The Board needs to have some conversations on how to approach these matters and some solid baseline training. ● Identify all areas noted for improvement / "suggestions" (beyond Compliance Requirements & Improvement Recommendations) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Besides the three standards that we didn't meet, the Team noted there were two recommendations (4 & 5) for improvement that pertain to facilities and finance, respectively. ✓ The Commission encourages institutions to give serious consideration to the recommendations and the advice contained in the Peer Review Team Report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Recommendation 4 on Standard III.B.1 - That the College continue to prioritize adequate resources to support a safe and healthful learning environment at all its operating sites. ➤ Recommendation 5 on Standard III.D.6. – That the final budget adopted by the Governing Board that is made available to the public is comprehensive and accurate. ✓ There are other areas that the Team suggested for improvements in the Team Report - Kristin/Sheri/Judy will put together an initial run of the suggestions from the Team Report to share with the Committee. If we notice something, we should look at that and act on it. We will develop a list to monitor it. ✓ In the Midterm Report, the College will include actions taken in response to our own improvement plans. ● Next Steps / Follow-Up Report Template Accreditation Handbook (all-in-one) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Kristin shared the follow-up report template from the Accreditation Handbook. It clearly spells out that we must demonstrate how we 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>have resolved the findings related to the three standards along with evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Although we have 3 years to resolve our issues per federal regulations and the Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions, not resolving these issues by March 1, 2025 puts us at risk of receiving a more severe sanction. ✓ ACCJC now has one comprehensive guide. Before, there were a number of guides covering different areas/topics, such as for the Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards, Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions, Guide for the Accreditation Liaison, Guide for Distance Education, etc. ✓ The Guide is a lot easier to read and follow, and it eliminates the redundancy. It is a great resource for accreditation. It is posted on our agenda and you can also find it on the ACCJC website. 	
6.	<p>Other Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coming soon: PGC Community Standards • Coming soon: Review of AP 2.07 - Participatory Governance on the horizon 	<p>Participatory Governance Council (PGC) Community Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PGC Community Standards Workgroup has developed soon-to-be-released Community Standards for participatory governance. • All the standing committees will need to adopt the community standards. • For more information, here is the presentation presented to PGC. <p>Review of AP 2.07 – Participatory Governance on the horizon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College will be reviewing AP 2.07 soon. Some of the language in the policy is no longer true. • There are language changes such as simply indicating that the Chancellor assigns the Chair of PGC (to date, BP/AP 2.07 indicated that the chair is the VC of Academic Affairs). • AP 2.07 will go to the Academic Senate, Administrators Association, Classified Senate, and Associated Students for vetting. Kristin will also have the Accreditation Steering Committee review it too. 	

Spring 2024 Meeting Dates: 3/5, 4/2, 5/7 from 3-5 pm

Minutes taken by Judy Seto