I. Minutes from September 18 meeting approved

II. Updated on Midterm Report

The Midterm Report has been sent and received by ACCJC-WASC. Report and supporting documentation (Survey results, AIP) are posted up on Accreditation intranet site.

III. Review of Accreditation Survey

The committee reviewed survey results, focused on emerging themes. In some cases results reinforced attention on issues also evident in the AIP.

* Communication – several responses reflected the perception there is insufficient communication on campus.

Possible solutions to pursue:

- More Town Hall Meetings, well scheduled so people can participate. But need to also ensure there is follow up to these Town Halls – apathy follows when people raise concerns and see no movement or response in any form.
- Require Divisions meet since this is an important means to inform faculty and staff of pending issues and where they can raise questions and concerns. This would help in communication and relations between Deans, Division Chairs and program faculty.
- Use new tools to overcome ineffectiveness of myriad email announcements for example SharePoint task stream tool or website to post updated information (e.g. regarding facilities issues.)
- Need to continue to train/orient committee members of responsibilities as representatives. Make them more accountable in terms of facilitating communication.

Follow Up - Marcia will pursue with Chancellor a Town Hall dealing with communication. As part of this meeting, will solicit feedback on kinds of topics faculty/staff want to be more informed about. Starting list of topics where people want to be more informed includes: outcome
(process) of making final budget determinations; decisions and bases for hiring and filling vacant positions; facilities updates (why things are under repair etc.); outcomes of assessment reporting (system and campus level).

* Crisis Management Team – very low level of awareness of the role of this group.

Follow up: need to directly inform campus of role and responsibilities of this group. Broader issue discussed, need visible plan and instructions on how to deal with a shooter situation – increased concern about this possibility.

* Program Review (system communication) – concerns about what happens to program review reports once they go to the system level.

* Reorganization – still evident concerns about impact of reorganization.

Follow up: Need to investigate further to find out particulars; probably better to do this via targeted investigation rather than campus wide survey, especially since many registered ‘Neutral’ – likely because they are not directly involved or aware of what was reorganized.

* Assessment – need to be clearer on use of assessment data e.g. what is happening with inventories? Not being consistently gathered nor clear use of information. Need to think about what we want to share as part of our public face, on public website. Good start in having bookend events of Fall and Spring Assessment Showcase.

Also need to have clear and meaningful administrative assessment process. Plan was created in 2012 but has not been implemented. Skepticism by some about whether negative feedback raised in 360 evaluations has any impact.

Follow up: Need to have a public process of assessment of administrators. Also - important need is place for storage of assessment data – is a working priority of the Assessment Committee.
* **Hiring Process** – results for this were good, show improvement and positive attitudes.

* **Budget Process** – concerns about long involved process but do not know final decisions, or bases for these decisions.

Follow up- administration needs to do more work informing campus of other factors (e.g. external) that go into final budget decisions. Explain other criteria and processes at system, BOR and even legislative levels.

* **General evaluation of the survey** – good response rate, but by including the Neutral option, does make it harder to get a sense of campus majority attitudes. Survey had too many questions which might have put some people off or made them less attentive. Was mentioned administration read the results and discussed implications – suggestion that information is useful and should continue to do these kinds of evaluations.

**IV. Pre-Planning for next Self-Study**
Committee will have to educate itself and campus on new standards, perhaps at a spring Town Hall meeting.

Will need to determine if we want to maintain structure of co-Chairs for Standards, with one Chair an administrator. Pros and cons discussed including administrators as co-chairs bring expertise, it builds collegial bonds and ensures administrative engagement in decisions and priorities set, but also concern administrative presence as Chair (rather than member of committee) can have a chilling effect on criticisms and issues brought up and sometimes too busy to share workload. Also administrators should avoid assuming shared knowledge on part of faculty and staff in addressing issues.

**V. Follow up tasks for next meeting**
All committee members asked to review the AIP to identify issues that need addressing.