Accreditation Steering Advisory Group

2016-2017 Academic Year

Meeting Notes
October 5, 2016 ~ 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Members: ALO: Kim Hoffmans; Faculty Co-Chair: Eric Martinsen
Kammy Algiers, Emily Bartel, Michael Bowen, Jack Bennett, Scott Brewer, Phillip Briggs, Michael Callahan, Colleen Coffey, Eileen Crump, Jeanine Day, Maureen Eliot, Karen Engelsen, Greg Gillespie (President), Tim Harrison, Bill Hart, Grant Jones, David Keebler, Alex Kolesnik, Gwen Lewis-Huddleston, Rachel Marchioni, Debbie Newcomb, Peder Nielsen, Mark Pauley (Budget and Resource Council Co-Chair), Steve Palladino, Arlene Reed, Peter Sezzi, Lisa Smith, Rick Trevino, Lynn Wright, and Pamela Yeagley.

Guests: K. Schrader, Felicia Torres

Absent: Kim Hoffmans, Kammy Algiers, Emily Bartel, Michael Bowen, Scott Brewer, Colleen Coffey, Eileen Crump, Maureen Eliot, Greg Gillespie (President), Tim Harrison, David Keebler, Gwen Lewis-Huddleston, Rachel Marchioni, Peder Nielsen, Steve Palladino, Arlene Reed, Peter Sezzi, Lisa Smith, Rick Trevino,

Notes:

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
A. Call to Order	E. Martinsen called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m.			
B. Public Comments	K. Schrader – As an outside observer, wanted to complement Accreditation Steering Advisory Committee team. She was very impressed with everyone's efforts and accomplishments.			
C. Approval of Meeting Notes: Sept. 7, 2016	E. Martinsen asked for any corrections and/or amendments to the meeting notes as presented. There were none. Meeting notes were approved via consensus.			
D. Announcements/Information Items				
	E. Martinsen drew the meeting's attention to the College President's newsletter, and campus wide email, in which the President shared the visiting accreditation team's commendations. Martinsen read these out loud:			

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
	The team commends Ventura College on: 1. **The significant transparency and institutional collaboration that occurred in the preparation of an excellent Institutional Self Evaluation Report.** 2. **The expanded inclusion of classified staff involvement at the college exemplified by the classified 9+1 description included in the Making Recommendations at Ventura College document.** 3. **The support and use of innovative technology including website information and design, distance education, and use of data and data systems.** 4. **Well maintained and attractive grounds and facilities conducive to a learning environment.** **There were no noted items of concern other to recognize that the college continue to address items mentioned in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report including ongoing sustainable quality improvement in program review and a plan to address aging facilities.** **The team was also complementary of our Qualify Focus Essay initiatives.**			

E. Discussion Items
    1. **Visiting Team Observations**
	Commendations from the Visiting Team
	    -See above.			

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
	• Karen Engelsen inquired about feedback regarding the district office visit: ○ Alex Kolesnik responded that we can expect to have recommendations from ACCJC in Jan/Feb with a follow up report in 12 to 18 months, but it doesn't seem like a lot will need to be addressed. Team mentioned that college is already addressing the recommendations they made, such as ageing facilities. Recommendations for district include updating evaluation instruments, making sure SLOs are explicitly mentioned. • It was reported that Accreditation Team asked if part-time faculty is paid for SLOs and assessments—at VC they are not paid additional time but it is expected they participate in SLO assessment as part of their faculty assignments.			

2. Process Improvement Suggestions	• Jack Bennet complemented the smooth process and also suggested starting earlier for next time.
	
	• Discussion ensued regarding standard leads. It is important for it to always be clear who the leads are and what that means. It was noted that there were some problems with disseminating information in the beginning. The suggestions made were having written something sooner, followed by editing, as well as, establishing a secure location for storing documents which can survive even if lead changes.
	  ○ A suggestion for this was using a project management software, with all files on a share drive.
	    ▪ Alex Kolesnik mention that there is a software available through the district			

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:

	but IT is working on getting it cloud based.
	• Another recommendation was to create a system like Debbie Newcomb did for SLOs for making sure changes are reflected across the board – e.g. if one document is changed, changes are immediately made to any affected documents. In terms of accreditation, the suggestion refers to making the ISER a living document.
	
	The group agreed it would be best to keep the ISER relative and up to date in an effort to stay ahead of the game.
	
	• In the opinion of some group members, the language didn't flow/was hard to follow. It was thought that perhaps this was as a result of having several authors which helped divvy up the load but may have taken away from overall clarity.
	   o E.Martinsen noted that last time we got dinged for sounding too much like one voice, and perhaps we over corrected this time. We can work on consistency and style.
	
	• Perhaps evidence collection should be assigned to one individual – however, key evidence then needs to be properly labelled and filed before submission.
	
	• It was further suggested to work more towards establishing good standards for minute taking so that minutes and meeting notes can provide good/substantive evidence.
	   o Professional development for minute taking is supposed to be on the books for Fall 2016.
	   o Minute takers should know what is substantive enough to be considered evidence.			

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
	• Grant Jones suggested using file name as an identifier for file storage ○ -e.g. "AC" for accreditation plus code listing substantive topics. Eric Martinsen supports taking on the living document concept—asked for somebody to lead on "evidence collecting" exploration. No volunteers/nominees as of yet. Continue at next meeting –			
3. **Discussion of Committee charge and purpose**	The groups discussed the narrowness of the current charge and suggestions for broadening the committee scope. Dialog included: • Is "monitoring" sufficient as a charge? • Who are we recommending to? The Executive team or directly to the CPC? According to flow chart we are under the CPC…so we report to them and then it goes to leadership council. New territory by keeping this a living document/process. It was suggested to look at other colleges and what their advisory charges are. Alex and Eric will look at charge for next meeting.			
4. **Goals and accomplishments**	Not formally discussed other than above.			
5. **Other**	None.			
6. **Meeting Takeaways**	• SER should be a living document • Evidence collection should be ongoing • Advisory Group's Charge to be updated			
F. Action Items				

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
	None			
G. Adjournment	E. Martinsen adjourned the meeting at 4:43 p.m.			
Next Meeting Date:	December 7, 2016 @ 3:30 pm, MCW-312			