Minutes – Accreditation Oversight Committee  December 6, 2013
Convened 12:00 ; adjourned 1:00  Present: Jeff Stearns, Marcia Roberts- Deutsch, Silvan Chung, Patrick Patterson, Clara Bantolina, Steven Shigemoto, Cynthia Smith, Mike Leidemann, Kaleo Gagne  Not Present: Katy Ho-Middleton, Russell Uyeno, Jeffrey Kanemoto

I. Minutes
   Minutes were approved as written.

II. Accreditation Update and Camus Response

Marcia provided a brief summary of feedback from the ACCJC visiting team Chair, based on the exit meeting and draft of findings sent to the Chancellor for review. The campus was deemed to have met 4 out of the 6 recommendations, and partially met 2. It was felt that in part this was due to the fact the campus has not had the chance to carry out and complete a full cycle of assessment and responses. One recommendation (assessment of non-instructional units) judged as partially met is a carry-over item so there is some concern, however the Chancellor has written a lengthy response related to all the evidence to be taken into consideration and the College’s readiness to close the loop. She will also meet with the ACCJC Board at the January meeting. The second recommendation also partially met related to evaluation of personnel; again, systems and policies are in place and now need to be implemented on a standard cycle. Marcia stressed that comments made at the exit meeting in October and in the draft of the letter included many strongly positive commendations, as well as acknowledgement of work done and meaningful actions taken by the campus in response to the six recommendations.

Once the final version of the report is sent to the ACCJC board, they will vote on the College’s status, likely in late January / early February. This will be shared with the campus as soon as it is reported. It is anticipated the campus will be asked to submit another progress report. It was emphasized that there needs to be consistent communication and reporting to students on accreditation updates.

Marcia concluded by recognizing that several people put in a lot of work to meet recommendations e.g. regarding Gen Ed and DE, and now the key is to maintain momentum.

III. Review of Actionable Improvement Plan/ How to Move Forward

Marcia moved on to the AIP, the list of needed actions identified by the self-study committees, many of which relate to issues in recommendations that put the campus on warning.
It was mentioned the Planning Council is already reviewing its mission and as well as Institutional Learning Outcomes, and this review will include work by a sub-committee as well as Town Hall meetings. It was also noted the PC will need to review and assess the process of budgeting currently underway.

Marcia mentioned the AOC should decide whether to run another governance survey in Spring 2014 to measure impact of changes in policies and personnel since the last survey undertaken prior to the self-study.

Marcia also noted work being done to compile a multi-year assessment calendar, to better enable cyclical adherence and coordination of various campus assessment efforts. Another round of CCSSE assessment will take place in Spring 2014.

The committee was tasked with reviewing the AIP (previously sent out electronically to the group) to determine what recommendations have been met, and/or the status of compliance. AOC members should also note if there is a felt need to revise the list of those responsible for meeting the recommendations.

The question was raised regarding how some items can be demonstrated, e.g. ‘institutionalizing the mission.’ Some possibilities were discussed and this discussion will continue as the committee reviews AIP status.

IV. Discussion of Committee Structure

The committee discussed the possibility of committee restructuring. There was consensus about creating an ‘umbrella’ committee - an Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) - with two sub-committees: the AOC and Assessment Committee. Though there are overlap duties, the mission and focus of these two committees are sufficiently distinct to warrant two sub-committees; necessary linkage would be done through membership of the IEC committee, which could be a steering committee including representatives from both. This IEC could be responsible for delegation of duties, and archiving and documentation of committee activities. It was suggested we look carefully at committee structures and hierarchies at other campuses to help inform this discussion and decision.

Issues discussed included concerns about too much overlap, redundancy of committee members, and the basis for determining how duties are differentiated and delegated.

V. Meeting Schedule for Spring 2014
The committee decided on a Spring 2014 meeting time of every 3rd Friday, at 11:00. One exception will be the January meeting which will take place on January 17th at 12:00.