

**ACCREDITATION & STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES  
COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES—JANUARY 26, 2017**



**Members  
in  
Attendance**

Horace Alexander   
 Autumn Blackburn   
 Amy Avelar   
 Susan Bangasser   
 Tarif Halabi   
 Rick Hrdlicka   
 Celia Huston   
 Amy Jennings

Albert Maniaol   
 Rocio Aguayo   
 Diana Rodriguez   
 Ricky Shabazz   
 Scott Stark   
 James Smith   
 Kay Weiss   
 Kay D Yarbrough

*SBVC provides quality education and services that support a diverse community of learners.*

**Topic**

**Discussion and Action**

**Approval of Minutes—**

Kay Weiss motioned to approved the minutes as written; James Smith 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion. Minutes approved, with two abstentions (D. Rodriguez and R. Hrdlicka).

**Draft Mid-Term Report**

Celia Huston reviewed the update mid-term report, which was redone based on the new standards from ACCJC. We no longer need to report on deficiencies. Went back and looked at things with admin staff and faculty and looked at several themes where we made improvements, such as cultural competency, institutional planning. This is a rough draft, things in brackets and italics, notes to myself, where we need to shape up.

Report on recommendations to improve highlights:

- Pg. 8, College Recommendation 2
- 1.B.7., 1.B.4--align with College Recommendation 2
- College Recommendation 3—focus on research and planning
- College Recommendation 4—review financial aid process, make necessary changes; need to start drafting and need information up to Fall 2016
- College Recommendation 5—re: student complaint process
- 3.B.1—re: safety issues, Scott Stark provided a summary
- Pg. 13, 3.B.2.a.—not required to report anymore, we can decide whether or not to report, provide Scott Stark’s summary.
- Pg. 14, 2.B.3.c.—SSSP plan, we have a write-up
- 3.D.1.b.—Scott Stark provided progress report

For committee review and consideration.

Kay Weiss asked if we could have a single document of planning agenda. Celia referenced a handout on this at the last meeting.

Celia wanted to know if it looks like we’re shaping up ok? Ref. pg. 4, planning areas from the self-evaluation process. She has met with James. James referenced a table prepared of all the campus and community meetings we’ve had.

<p><b>Draft Mid-Term Report (con't)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg. 5, list of places in the self-study, pull and emphasize competency piece. Kay Weiss said we have had a lot of speakers on cultural competency. Discussion ensued on other areas that fall into this theme, Valley Bound, First-Year Experience, College Promise (for future planning)—will document the conversation.</li> </ul> <p>Celia asked for feedback from committee members who have been on visiting teams and reading reports. Both Kay Weiss and Susan Bangasser provided feedback—don't spend a lot of time on mid-term report review because the reports are not long, noting that the standards have changed. We don't want to generate a report that may cause a visit. Celia said the important thing is that we have an ongoing process vs. once every six years.</p> <p>Another topic of discussion was on SLOs. We can talk about this in the report and in College Recommendations 2 and 3, or can decide where to put this topic in the report later.</p> <p>Moving forward and with a new president who will have different perspectives, something to add to the report and document.</p> <p>Celia proposing to have a final draft to the campus for review and feedback by May 2017.</p>
<p><b>Data and Evidence for Mid-Term Report</b></p>	<p>Celia noted the data that ACCJC is requesting, the review of last three years' worth of data required by ACCJC.</p> <p>James Smith still pulling the numbers together and will have data at the next meeting.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on Accreditation Committee having representatives from each division/departments. A quick review shows we need a rep from Math/Bus/CIT division. Celia to see if we can add a representative for this area.</p>
<p><b>Aligning Learning Outcomes with Program Review</b></p>	<p>Discussion ensued on the processes: three years for SLOs; four years for Program Review, and changing SLO process to align from three years to four years to match Program Review—we're being asked to report the most current data. Further discussion ensued on creating a report and adding to the mid-term report. It was suggested that this committee initiate the proposal to make this change.</p> <p>Note: add Accreditation and SLOs to the next Program Review agenda on 2/17/17. Kay Weiss to talk with Paula Ferri-Milligan about putting this item on the agenda.</p> <p>The end result of discussion was the more we can move towards cloud-based processes for SLOS, the better it will be for all involved.</p>

<b>Other</b>	<p>James Smith requested discussion on an item not on the agenda on the process for substantive changes. Kay Dee Yarbrough said the Instruction Office doesn't have a process for substantive changes, and needs a written process (ref. process to ACCJC). New programs go to ACCJC, and would like the Accreditation Committee to establish the process for substantive changes.</p> <p>Diana Rodriguez suggested the committee draft a process stating we will follow the guidelines set forth by . . . cut/paste into a written by ACCJC's process.</p> <p>James Smith said we will cut and paste (language) written process and bring back to the committee for review at the next meeting.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on past substantive changes. Have started process with an email to ACCJC with notification of substantive change proposal, after which ACCJC would give approval. This is something that was done in advance.</p>
<b>Next meeting:</b>	February 9, 2017, (or to be determined), 1:00-2:30 p.m. All meetings will be held in the President's Conference Room, ADSS-207, unless otherwise noted.

DRAFT