

	Accr	editation Com	mittee	
MINUTES FOR Friday, Ma	arch 4, 2016	1:00 p.m.	Cravens Student Services Center, Multipurpose Room	
Members Present:	Dr. Annebelle Nery (Co-Chair), Bert Bitanga (Co-Chair), Dr. Courtney Doussett, Dr. Daniel Martinez, Donna Greene, Dr. Joel Kinnamon, Dr. Kelly Hall, Dr. Leslie Young, Dr. Wendy Sanders			
Members not Present:	Dr. Kim Dozier, Lisa Howell			
Guest(s):	Amanda Phillips, Dr. Carl Farmer, Dr. Chris Jones-Cage, Daniel Aucutt, Diane Wirth, Gene Durand, Jeff Baker, Jenn Baker, John Ramont, Jon Fernald, Katie Chartier, Rick Rawnsley, Sandi Hauf, Sheri Willis, Stella Baker			
Recorder:	Mary Lou Marru	jo		

## **AGENDA**

AGENDA					
1. Call to Order/Roll Call	– Quorum was met.				
2. Action Item(s)					
2.1 Approval of Agenda					
DISCUSSION	Bert Bitanga stated that to accommodate a time commitment for one of the				
	chairs, he would like to move one of the it				
CONCLUSION	Motion was made by Joel Kinnamon and seconded by Annebelle Nery to move				
	item 3.2 (Progress Report of Standard Chairs) before 3.1 (Accreditation Institute				
	topics).				
	Agenda approved unanimously as amende				
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE		
2.2 Approval of December 4, 2015 Minutes					
DISCUSSION					
CONCLUSION	Approved as submitted.				
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE DEADLINE				
3. Information/Discussion	n Item(s)				
3.1 Progress Report of Sta	andard Chairs				
DISCUSSION	• Standard III-C (Co-Chairs: Dr. Kim Dozi	<mark>ier and Sheri Willis)</mark> —Sh	eri reported		
	that she and Kim have met. They've created a separate document for each				
	question with bullet points on the topics they need to cover. They've identified				
	evidence which they have begun to store on the IT (Information Technology)				
	web portal. They continue to identify resources they will need, as well as				
	individuals they will need to meet with. They will be reaching out to student				
	representatives.				
	<ul> <li>Standard I (Co-Chairs Dr. Courtney D.</li> </ul>				
	Courtney advised they have created a f				
	questions and bullet points and have b				
	evidence. They have also started meetin	g with their team, but sti	II need to fill		

in some of those areas. They've met with Annebelle and Bert to review several important items they need to finish before they can continue to fill in other areas. She noted that there are specific elements missing from our mission statement; such as stating the specific types of degrees we offer and the inclusion of distance education. Annebelle advised that the Assessing of Planning & Outcomes committee (APO) is about to finish up some major work, so perhaps Courtney could attend an APO meeting to introduce what is missing from the Mission Statement so they can move it forward in the process. Daniel added that when discussing goals for the accreditation, they will be linking these goals with efforts that are part of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) annual report, which has components that can be integrated.

- Standard II-A (Co-Chairs Dr. Leslie Young and Dr. Wendy Sanders)—Wendy created a discussion framework template that has been adopted by several of the other co-chairs. This template includes the questions in a framework which should make it easier for people to respond to. She has sent hers out to faculty and administrative staff. Wendy mentioned that at the Accreditation Institute workshop she recently attended, it was suggested that a repository be set up on our web site where faculty and administration can place feedback they get from students and the community, such as letters of commendation, which can be referenced as part of the accomplishments.
- Standard II-B (Co-Chairs Daniel Aucutt, Donna Greene, and Katie Chartier)—
   Donna reported their team has met and they have begun charting their next steps and identifying evidence. They are still trying to get an ASCOD representative and a faculty from the Math department.
- Standard II-C (Co-Chairs, Amanda Phillips, Sandi Hauf and Scott Cooper)— Annebelle thanked Amanda, Sandi and Scott for taking over this standard as co-chairs. She added that Amanda and Sandi do have accreditation experience in student support services, as they have been part of the process. She added that all of the leaders in student support services have been asked to take the online Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) training course and are all participating in the writing prompts so they learn the accreditation process. Amanda reported that their team is identifying evidence that will be required, as well as ascertaining areas of improvement.
- Standard III-A (Co-Chairs Diane Wirth and Dr. Chris Jones-Case)—Diane stated that she and Gene Durand attended the Accreditation Institute workshop recently in San Diego, which was extremely helpful. Their team has met and reviewed the accreditation evidence documents from the previous accreditation, as well as reviewed the weak points brought out in the previous self-evaluation report.
- Standard III-D (Co-Chairs Lisa Howell and Dr. Carl Farmer)—Carl reported he
  and Lisa have met to review the timeline and discussed the team they need to
  bring together. They also spent time reviewing Napa Valley Community
  College's self-evaluation report.
- <u>Standard IV (Co-Chairs Dr. Joel Kinnamon and Dr. Kelly Hall)</u>

  —Kelly stated she and Joel have met and will use the discussion framework template that Wendy provided. They have divided up the work and identified areas where

	they will need to gather more informa	tion. They are also revie	wing policies	
	and procedures to assist with some of t	CARRIED STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF	0 1	
CONCLUSION				
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	
	sett needs to get on an APO agenda to ments missing from the college Mission	Annebelle Nery		
Std II-A—Check into setting up a drop box on the Accreditation web site where faculty and administrators can place positive feedback from students and the community to include as evidence.  Annebelle Nery and Mary Lou Marrujo evidence.				
<ul> <li>Std II-B—Follow-up wit ASCOD representative.</li> </ul>	h Carlos Maldonado regarding request for	Mary Lou Marrujo		
3.2 Accreditation Institut	e topics			
DISCUSSION	<ul> <li>Bert asked for feedback from those that workshop in San Diego.</li> <li>Sheri Willis commented that she attend technique on how to tell your story. She evidence. What format will we be usin create? Annebelle commented that or editor, Rick Rawnsley. The evidence will clear format. Rick added that he will for</li> <li>Leslie Young reported that one of the big disaggregated data. Bert attended the very robust discussion on using the datage groups, gender, disability, face-to-fmany schools do not have the resources if we are going to do this, then a good plathat have a lot of sections. Discussion information using student ID numbers. Information as a pilot and bring it to the</li> <li>Donna Green mentioned that there we distance education courses and effectionshells are being evaluated.</li> </ul>	ded a session where they asked how we will be prog? What is the standard or unified voice will contains answer the questions in mat the report so it is easy topics that got everyones ame session and stated at the student level, esto collect this data. Lesting to start is just the requirement on how to Bert said he will put togon ext meeting for more das also quite a bit of di	discussed a esenting the we want to ne from our a logical and by to read e talking was there was a log. ethnicity, i.e. However, ie sated that lired courses extract this gether some iscussion.	
CONCLUSION				
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	
2.2 Paula Cil mi II				
3.3 Review of the Timelin DICUSSION	Bert advised that we will have another meed evaluation report is due July 29 <sup>th</sup> . Once disseminated throughout the college for fellows an advantage of the Moreov of the semester. The expectation today is make sure you know who is available as reyour representatives. By the month of Markey sure was a sure of the month of Markey or the month of	the draft is completed edback. lay meeting is to meet be to confirm everyone is esources, and to make su	fore the end on-track, to re you have	

hand-outs to share with the group. They do not have to be full drafts, but they should be outlines or worksheets with bullet points completed so that it will be a working meeting. Let Annebelle or Bert know if you need help with the writing; there is a team to support with that.			
Co-chairs to have a draft outline for May r	Co-chairs to have a draft outline for May meeting.		
	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	
3.4 Quality Focus Essay (QFE)			
Bert reminded the group that a new requirement of the self-study report is th Quality Focus Essay (QFE); wherein we identify two or three areas that we nee to work on as an institution. These narratives will need to be more detailed an include a thorough action plan, which we will be accountable. The topics should be related to the accreditation standards.			
Bert agreed to write one of the topics for the QFE.			
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		DEADLINE	
ill get clarification on the requirements of the vill start coming up with ideas on topics for			
	should be outlines or worksheets with but a working meeting. Let Annebelle or Bert Is there is a team to support with that.  Co-chairs to have a draft outline for May In the control of t	should be outlines or worksheets with bullet points completed so to a working meeting. Let Annebelle or Bert know if you need help with there is a team to support with that.  Co-chairs to have a draft outline for May meeting.  PERSON RESPONSIBLE  (QFE)  Bert reminded the group that a new requirement of the self-study Quality Focus Essay (QFE); wherein we identify two or three areas to work on as an institution. These narratives will need to be more include a thorough action plan, which we will be accountable. The to be related to the accreditation standards.  Bert agreed to write one of the topics for the QFE.  PERSON RESPONSIBLE ill get clarification on the requirements of the	

NEXT MEETING:

TBA

College of the Desert Accreditation Master Timeline Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER)

TASK	STIS STIS STIS STIS STIS STIS STIS STIS	
ŏ	Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb	
ALO and Accreditation Faculty Chair Meetings		
Accreditation Team Meeting		
Define Standard Teams		
Discuss Accreditation Timeline		
Review of Standards		
Accreditation Team Meeting (Standard Teams Defined)		
Procurement and Collection of Information		
Standards Team Meeting		
Accreditation Team Meeting (Prog report of findings)		
Writing Standard ISER Draft		
Standard ISER Draft Due 7/29/2016		
Standard ISER Draft to Editor		
Desiminate ISER Draft to Campus (Get Feedback)		
Accreditation Team Meeting (Campus input & QFE)		
Define Topic for Quality Focus Essay (QFE)		
Define Desired Goals and Outcomes		
Provide Actions Steps to be Implemented		
Define Timeline for Implementation		
QFE to Provide Clear Lines of Responsibility and		
Sustainability		
Define Resources for QFE recommendations		
Define Institutional Plan for Evaluating Outcomes and		
Effectiveness of the Project		
Writing ISER Final Draft		LEGEND
ISER Final Draft Due		
ISER Final Draft to Editor		Mostings
ISER Final Draft to Academic Senate		28
Accreditation Team Meeting		Gather Info / Writing of ISEB / OFF
Desiminate ISER Final Draft to Campus		ממוכן אוומון פו וסבוע לעב
Modifications to ISER Final Draft Due (If needed)		Drafts to Editor
Final Revisions to Editor ( If needed )		
Final ISER to Academic Senate		Due Date or External Team Site Visit
Final ISER to Board of Trustees		
Accreditation Team Meeting (Prelim Prep for Visit)		ISER Draft/Final to AS or Board of Trustees
Send Final ISER to ACCIC August 1, 2017		
Send Final ISER to External Team August 1, 2017		meet legated/01/04 of 919 legis has
Detailed preparations for Site Visit		
Accreditation Team Visit October 2017		Detailed Preparations for Site Visit
Draft Evaluation Team Report sent to College CEO		
Commission meeting and decision on accreditation		ACCIC Review and Reporting to COD
Commission action letter received by College posted to		

## The Quality Focus Essay

When an institution undertakes self-evaluation for accreditation, it may identify policies, procedures, or practices in need of change or student outcomes it wishes to improve. An institution may make some changes or improvements immediately, before an evaluation team arrives. Other changes and strategies for improving outcomes will require a longer time to accomplish. These changes and strategies should be identified as the institution's plans for improvement (action plans), and should be integrated into the ongoing planning and decision making processes at the college, with timelines for completion. Using the format of a Quality Focus Essay (QFE), an institution will identify two or three "action projects" for further study and action that have good potential for improving student outcomes. The projects should be related to Accreditation Standards, emerge from the institution's examination of its own effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of student learning and student achievement, be based on the institution's analysis of data collected, and identify areas of needed change, development, and improvement. The Guide provides questions intended to stimulate discussion and assist the institution in selecting appropriate action projects for the QFE in boxed format proceeded by the notation QFE. The QFE, with a 5,000 word limit, describes the projects in detail to include the following components:

- Identification of the Projects: The projects should be vital to the long-term improvement of student learning and achievement over a multi-year period;
- Desired Goals/Outcomes: The QFE should describe specific, well-defined goals expected to lead to observable results;
- Actions/Steps to be Implemented: The QFE (or an Appendix to the QFE) should provide the steps to be implemented for each project;
- Timeline: The QFE (or Appendix) should include a calendaring of all steps to be implemented;
- Responsible Parties: The QFE should provide clear lines of responsibility for implementation and sustainability;
- Resources: The QFE should include a realistic plan for the resources (human, physical, technology, or financial resources) the institution will need in order to implement and sustain the projects;
- Assessment: The QFE should include the institution's plan for evaluating the outcomes and effectiveness of the projects.

The comprehensive evaluation team and the Commission will review and provide constructive feedback on the QFE, with the goal of supporting institutional efforts to enhance student learning and achievement. At the Midterm, the institution will provide a progress report or, if the projects are completed, a final report on the outcomes of the projects.

Resource: Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions, July 2015 Revised Edition, page 3.

H. Quality Focus Essay Continuous quality improvement is a mark of institutional effectiveness. As an institution evaluates its programs and services in the continuous cycle of data analysis, planning, resource allocation, and evaluation, it examines its effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of student learning and student achievement. During that examination, it identifies areas of needed change, development, institutionalization, and expansion. Within the accreditation focus on continuous quality improvement, the institution will identify two or three areas coming out of the institutional self-evaluation on which the institution has decided to act (action projects), and which will have significance over a multi-year period. These will be described in a Quality Focus Essay (QFE). The Essay will have a 5,000 word limit and will discuss in detail the identified areas to be acted upon, including responsible parties, timeline, and anticipated outcomes, and the impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Essay will be related to the Accreditation Standards; institutions should select the "action projects" for the QFE from college data and analysis. The projects described in the QFE should be realistic and culminate in a set of observable and measurable outcomes. The Essay should be consistent in its factual basis and analysis with the other portions of the college's Self Evaluation Report. It will provide the institution with multi-year, long-term directions for improvement and demonstrate the institution's commitment to excellence. The areas identified in the Essay will become critical focal points for the institution's Midterm Report. Evaluation teams and the Commission will comment on the institution's QFE and may offer constructive advice or assistance.

## Appendix L: Evaluation Tool for Assessing the Quality Focus Essay

AP= Action Projects

QFE= Quality Focus Essay

1. The QFE describes two or three areas, Action Projects (AP), coming out of the institutional self evaluation upon which the institution has decided to act.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the QFE- 1 point	Addressed adequately in the QFE- 2 points	Addressed well in the QFE- 3 points

2. The Action Projects (AP) come out of the institution's examination of its effectiveness in providing student learning and achievement in the context of its mission.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP- 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

3. The data and analysis used as a basis for selecting the AP are described.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

Question 1-3 Assessment Narrative:

 The QFE identifies the areas of needed change, development, institutionalization, and/or expansion.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- O points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the QFE- 1 point	Addressed adequately in the QFE- 2 points	Addressed well in the QFE- 3 points

 The QFE discusses in detail the AP, and includes the manner of implementation, timelines, and integration with ongoing, integrated planning, resource allocation, and reevaluation processes at the institution.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- O points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

6. The AP activities as described are realistic and will have significance over a multi-year period.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points
		a.	107 32 33	

Question 4-6 Assessment Narrative:

7. The anticipated outcomes and impact on academic quality and institutional effectiveness are detailed for the AP.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

8. The AP outcomes are observable and measurable.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

9. The AP are related to the Accreditation Standards and are consistent with other portions of the institution's Self Evaluation Report.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- 0 points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

Question 7-9 Assessment Narrative:

10. Over all, the AP demonstrate the institution's commitment to excellence.

Place an "x" under the description that best fits your assessment of this factor:

Missing- O points	Not described adequately- 1 point	Not a significant part of the AP - 1 point	Addressed adequately in the AP - 2 points	Addressed well in the AP - 3 points

Question 10 Assessment Narrative:

2.		 	
3.		 	
4.	V. II.		
5.		 	
6		 	_
7			_
8		 	_
9 10.		 	

A score of below twenty, or more than two responses with a score of 1 or less, will require that the institution revise its essay for submission within one year.