FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Accreditation Self-Study Team Meeting
(Standard IV)
Friday, May 20, 2016

MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: President's conference room (Room 1901)
TIME: 10:00AM – 12:00PM

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Andrew LaManque, Carla Maitland, Justin Schultz, Nazy Galoyan, & Paula Norsell.

GUESTS:

Ruby Sodhi

I) Introductions

Andrew welcomed the newly formed team members and shared with them the recommendation shared at PaRC on the structure of the Steering Committee. Members also briefly introduced themselves and provided information on any past experience in serving on accreditation team/s.   More than half of the group had some experience with accreditation.

II) Orientation & Roles & Expectations

Andrew discussed that the purpose of the first meeting is to get up to speed on the work that needs to be accomplished through the self-study report and to plan work for fall 2016 and Spring 2017. He noted that the four teams would provide an open and collaborative process for the re-accreditation of the college. He provided everyone a handout of the proposal of the new structure of the self-study teams that was approved by PaRC in spring 2016 (see Appendix A). The accreditation self-study team leaders are:
1. Andrea Hanstein – Standard I (Mission, Academic Quality, & Institutional Effectiveness, & Integrity)
2. Carolyn Holcroft – Standard II (Student Learning Programs & Support Services)
3. Erin Ortiz – Standard III (Resources)
4. Andrew LaManque – Standard IV (Leadership & Governance)

Ruby will provide support for all accreditation related activities. Andrew outlined the roles and expectations for members who have volunteered to serve on this team based on ACCJC's *Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation*. Nazy asked a question about how to involve individuals who work at the district level. Andrew noted that it is yet to be determined how to involve additional input from the district. Some ideas included having one our two joint sessions with De Anza and District representatives, and or perhaps discussion at the Board study session. All agreed that it would be best if this team got up to speed first and then invited others in during the fall quarter. In the end we would want consistency with De Anza but this is a college self-study and so should reflect Foothill College themes. Paula provided information about prevailing district committees and their evolving work and how this information can be useful in addressing some of the areas in Standard IV (e.g. district wide collaboration and communication).

III) Accreditation Standards & Institutional Expectations

Andrew provided everyone a handout on Standard IV from the ACCJC's website on Accreditation Standards and encouraged everyone to read them. Andrew also shared a PowerPoint presentation about the accreditation kick-off meeting at Foothill College in February 2016.

Andrew informed members about a new addition to this self-study report - Quality Focused Essay that will be provided by the college to the Commission as one of the new requirements. Andrew encouraged everyone to read the last self-study report and the visiting team's evaluation and to focus on documenting and providing evidence of the work that has been and is being done by the college. Andrew also provided members a list of "Sources of Evidence," as examples for addressing Standard IV. Andrew noted that Foothill College employs an annual Governance survey that this committee may also want to look at and consider as part of the evidence. He also mentioned the use of Functional Map that is currently being updated about the work being accomplished as a college, district, or shared responsibility.

IV) Accreditation Timeline & Evidence

Andrew shared a handout on Accreditation Self-Study Timeline (see Appendix B). He informed the members that this team, along with the other three teams, will identify the themes and the Accreditation Steering Committee will guide the work of the teams. Ruby shared that information about the self-study teams (including meeting minutes) and accreditation related work will be posted on Foothill College's website soon. The members agreed to select two sections (IV.A.5 & IV.D.6) of Standard IV and discuss them. The discussion on IV.A.5 revolved around collecting evidence about district-wide communication involving institutional plans, policies, and curriculum. Suggestions included:

- Board policy 3250 Institutional Planning
- Board minutes showing approval of equity and educational master plans as well as Feb 2016 study session discussion
- Discussion of the revision of AP 2410 in Academic and Professional Matters Committee (APM) and Chancellor's advisory council (CAC).
- BP 2223 Role of the Academic Senate in Academic and Professional Matters
- Administrative procedures
- Board policy and administrative procedure 2410 Policy and Administrative Procedure
- District committee chart
- Governance evaluation survey
- Process for forming a taskforce
- Flowchart – AP2410
- Assessment taskforce –meeting minutes & planning documents
- Enrollment priority taskforce –evaluation of process in Academic and Professional Matters Committee
- Equity taskforce –meeting minutes & District Diversity & Equity Advisory Committee
- Budge Advisory Committee
- Board self-evaluation and decision to seek input from constituent groups
- Board priorities
- Curriculum committee minutes and Board minutes showing approval of curriculum
- Portal information – messages, security alerts
- Integrated planning & budgeting governance handbook

Evidence considered for IV.D.6. that would demonstrate communication between the district and the college included:
- - Chancellor's public communication/information
- District opening day – plenary session and workshops
- Middlefield center /development of new Education Center and decision making process for programming (substantive change doc)
- ETS town halls
- Curriculum

- Baccalaureate doc, minutes from APM and CAC, email from Chancellor Thor regarding program decision, Board minutes curriculum and substantive change approval, current financial discussion.
- NASA/AMES research initiative – University Associates (discussion of joint initiatives).
- Budget town hall meetings
- Process for determining number of faculty hires, how disseminated?

Members further discussed Standard IV in more detail. Andrew reminded everyone that the ACCJC is more focused on looking at outcomes, impact, and improvement rather than looking at planning documents as evidence. He encouraged the team to look for such alignment and integration in gathering and analyzing data for this standard. Members discussed specific examples where the process and its integration with college/district policies and procedures had being attained. As a closing statement, Andrew reminded everyone that the self-study is about writing our story and making recommendations to improve the college (see Appendix C).

I) Next Steps
All the members agreed to read the entire Standard IV and gather one piece of evidence for discussion at the next meeting.

**Proposal to PaRC on the Organization of the
Accreditation Self Study Teams**
April 14, 2016
Draft for PaRC Discussion

I. Accreditation Steering Committee
   a. A total of 4 members
   b. Academic Senate, Classified Senate, AOL, Marketing and Communications (Carolyn, Erin, Andrew, Andrea)
   c. Act as leads for each of the 4 self-study teams
   d. Work to develop consistency across teams – training, approach to data analysis, approach to dividing up the work, similar due dates
   e. Meet weekly or bi-weekly as needed starting spring 2016

   f. Other issues for Steering Committee discussion
       i. Quality Focused Essay
      ii. District Standards
     iii. Accreditation Survey
      iv. District / College Functional Map
       v. Development of timeline for teams
      vi. Communications

II. Self-Study Teams
   a. Volunteers needed!
   b. Previous experience not required!
   c. Not necessary to contribute as a writer – discussion and input is key
   d. Steering Committee members will act as "leads" – (no tri-chairs)
   e. Meet 2 times in spring 2016 and then more often (as necessary) in fall 2016 and winter 2017

Foothill College Accreditation Self Study Timeline

Winter '16	Spring '16	Fall '16	Winter '17	Spring '17	Fall '17
Kick-off*	Self Study Teams begin work: Accreditation Survey conducted by IRP (students and employees)	Teams complete first draft	Campus identifies QFE topics	Submit Self Study to Board of Trustees	ACCJC Site Team Visit
Organize and train self study teams		Teams use Survey Data	Continue to incorporate campus feedback; finalize self study		

*PaRC tri-chairs and ACCJC training attendees

1

Key Components of Self-Study Teams

- Engage stakeholders in a reflective and structured dialogue and examination of the programs/services.

- Focus on standards and evidence.

- Gather and organize data and analyses (program reviews, assessment reports, SLO data, student achievement data, demographic studies, environmental scan data).

- Use predictors on social and cultural trends (with support from IR).

- Meet regularly to develop the work in addressing the standard.

- Ensure integration of data and processes.

- Attend trainings, webinars, presentations, or other resource opportunities for guidance about preparing the Self Study report.

- Identify core themes (e.g. student success, SLOs, institutional commitments, dialogue, organization, institutional integrity, etc.)

- Refer to institutional reports (previous accreditation reports: self study, midterm, annual fiscal progress, substantive change reports, team reports, commission action letters), and institutional plans (education, facilities, financial, technology, and human resources).

- Set deadlines for all assigned activities in the Self Study process.

- Employ qualitative and quantitative measures.