

**ACCREDITATION & STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES—SEPTEMBER 28,
2017**



**Members
in
Attendance**

- Horace Alexander
- Autumn Blackburn
- Amy Avelar
- Tarif Halabi
- Rick Hrdlicka
- Celia Huston
- Amy Jennings
- Angela Grotke

- Albert Maniaol
- Diana Rodriguez
- Scott Thayer
- Scott Stark
- James Smith
- Kay Weiss
- Lorrie Burnham

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

Topic	Discussion and Action
Approval of Minutes—August 24, 2017	The committee members reviewed the minutes from 8/24/17. Kay Weiss motioned to approve the minutes with revision. James Smith 2 nd the motion. Minutes approved with revision.
ACCJC Mid-Term Report Update	
ACCJC Accreditation Standards Review	<p>Celia Huston said we are looking at the next self-evaluation for accreditation. The standards changed a few years ago (2014), e.g. glossary and/or standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference points . . . is this occurring? • Who is primary responsibility to ensure things happen? • What kind of actions are taking place? • What's new in the standards that we don't have a methodology? <p>James Smith noted for reference as the committee goes through the new standards, CW stands for cross-walk (old standards) and ER stands for eligibility requirements. A quick review of what the committee does is to review the standards, determine if they are being met on an annual basis. We discuss what is being met on the standards and the evidence; look at ways to build evidence and determining things are still happening. (Celia to share a table with the committee).</p> <p>Standard I.A.1.: Academic Senate; Classified Senate; ASG; College Council; major collegial consultations.</p> <p>Standard I.A.2.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review • Strategic Planning • College Council

<p>ACCJC Accreditation Standards Review</p>	<p>There seems to be a disconnect between current programs, new programs. Discussion ensued on the latest new program. Course objectives, strategic planning asre supposed to support the mission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did we follow the processes? • What does the mission specifically define? • Are we producing data and are we using it? • Are we looking at the needs as far as curriculum?
	<p>Standard I.A.3.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this done through program review? 2. Process is through program review and college council. 3. Where do SLOs come into play? 4. Funding requests—college council does resource allocation; then to program and back to accreditation committee. 5. Important for resource allocation not going to adhoc committees unless there is a representative body, suggested a one-page executive summary of institutional need with a yes or no and prevent ways to seek funding outside of program review. <p>Standard I.A.4.: Institutional mission is available, e.g., college catalog.</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p>Lorrie Burnham raised discussion on the Guided Pathways and ways to get funding. What would that look like? Exploring if we want to do this? Eligibility, we would need to do a self assessment. This was discussion in accreditation. What are the requirements. There is going to be a workshop on October 20th, staff to attend. Further discussion ensued on this topic.</p> <p>Other topic discussion on courses, students, programs and SAOs. Kay Weiss used an example with athletics programs, dance, reading, no-degree programs, and course SLOs using the appropriate processes for program. Will ultimately come to the accreditation committee for review.</p>
<p>Next meeting:</p>	<p>October 12, 2017, 1:00-2:30 p.m. All meetings will be held in the President’s Conference Room, ADSS-207, unless otherwise noted.</p>