

Standard I Accreditation Self Study Team
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
11-01-04

Members Present:

Andrew LaManque, Chair, Cindy Castillo, Lydia Hearn, Carolyn Keen,
Duane Kubo, Carolyn Wilkins-Green, Kevin Glapion, Carmen Pareda,
Christina Espinosa-Pieb, Pat Fifield

Minutes from meeting of 10-25-04 passed out for review and corrections. Correction suggested regarding comment that “President Brian Murphy indicated that we might need more Community involvement in the planning process” while that is a paraphrase of what was report ably indicated by President Murphy, he was not in attendance in the Standard I meeting.

Addendum to the area where question was raised regarding an employee who oversees student equity. The response was we do in the person of Marion Winters. Group wanted clarification that Marion does not have enough funding for all that needs to be done. There is not enough time to do everything.

The sub-groups are broken down as follows:

1. Part A Mission: **Carleen**, Lydia
2. Part B Governance (issues 1-4): **Rich**, Duane, Carolyn Wilkins-Green, Carolyn Keen, Carmen, Jean
3. Part B Assessment (issues 5-7) **Andrew**, Cindy, Mayra, Karl, Christina, Pat

Announcements

Robert Griffin, Allen Frische, Judy Mowrey, and Mike Brandy went on an accreditation visit to Oxnard College, Ventura College and Mesa College.

Indicated that this time around the committee is looking for more evidence.

Where are meeting minutes?

Where is documentation?

Is there evidence that a discussion did occur?

Looking for evidence of a dialog

An example was brought up that last year a lot of talk and meetings surrounding a mission statement, but the minutes of the various meetings do no reflect all that occurred.

Lots of discussion on the importance of taking minutes.

Why are they so important?

We don't have the staff to take, type, and distribute

We don't have the luxury of taking copious notes.

How does long minutes make you a better institution

Minutes are important to have a paper trail that items were discussed.

Discussion that meeting minutes could be brief and address what are the issues, what are the outcomes and what are the possible solutions. The outcome is that if the accreditation team is looking for evidence, we must have notes to back up our discussions.

Robert indicated that the commission is stressing Learning outcomes stressed. Institutions can define it the way they want as long as there is a discussion. The commission will ask -- has there been a dialog on learning outcomes?

Cindy Castillo presented a second draft on Part B Assessment (issues 5-7).

The draft points out that, a lot of assessment is done separately but it is not brought together; many divisions and departments survey their own students.

The drafts asks questions such as:

If something is an institutional priority, do we allocate funds to achieve the stated goals?

Do we use assessment for planning?

It was thought by the group that the college needed to be more systematic in its approach to planning.

Another suggestion was that the outcome of planning be reflected in just 1 or 2 goals a year. If the campus only selected 1 or 2 goals and we all worked on it something would get done. Right now there seems to be too many competing priorities.

Cindy to work on draft and bring it back to next meeting.

Next meeting 11-8-04 Don Bautista Room 12:30 to 1:30