ACCJC:

1. Providing faculty names for ACCJC visiting teams—Academic State Senate provide faculty names to the ACCJC for accreditation visiting teams

2. Develop processes for faculty participation on accrediting teams—“ensure that faculty comprise a minimum of 25% of the site visiting teams”—all visiting teams include a minimum of 3 faculty

3. Accreditation team visits—restore the direct observation of instruction by making classroom visits a required component of accreditation visiting team activities

4. ACCJC Communications—ACCJC explain clearly and fully any deficiencies when data aimed at satisfying their requirements are found to be lacking and to provide guidance to the college so that the college can address the ACCJC’s most urgent concerns in a timely manner

Support for sexual minorities:

1. Urge local senates to review their curricula, co-curricular activities, and campus practices for inclusion of all people, especially gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender/transsexual people (GLBT)

2. Academic State Senate employ appropriate venues to increase awareness of the issues impacting sexual minorities in the CA community colleges

Publishing student learning outcomes:

Encourage local senates to publish SLOs in any appropriate public domain entity such as the course outline of record, database, webpage, etc.

Eliminate eminence for meeting minimum qualifications

Eminence may no longer be used as the sole criterion to qualify faculty when evaluating minimum qualifications during the faculty hiring process

Exploring computer competencies needed for student success

1. Gather information regarding the required basic computer skills which may be needed for student success in college and the workforce and report back to the body

2. Explore the need for a computer skills competency requirement for students.

3. Survey local community colleges to determine which colleges have computer competency requirements and gather information on multiple methods or ways that students can achieve computer competency.
Reexamination of lab space allocations

Study the possibility of recommending changes to Title 5 with regard to the lab space allocation formulas to meet the distinctive needs of science and career technical education (CTE) programs.

Discussed SLOs for part-time instructors

Reason for sanction—2-year rule—deficiency on part of college and 2 years to correct that deficiency

Some issues to deal with to get to the top-level of the rubric for evaluating institutional effectiveness—Part 1: Program Review (ACCJC)

1. Biggest problem was with non-institutional area
2. Sell to the faculty—buy in—cultural change
3. Too many adjunct faculty
4. Funding comes from what you are doing
5. 50% rule for faculty
6. Follow through decisions made on what has been approved
7. Suppose to be SUSTAINABLE CONTINUOS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT stage

Rubric to evaluate institutional effectiveness—ACCJC is looking for:

1. Evidence
2. Linkage to Budget & Planning
3. Evaluation of the program review
4. Depth and breadth—looking at deep issues

Signs of successful linkage:

1. Communications
2. Planning driving budgeting NOT budget driving planning
3. Use of evidence
4. Program Review paper:
   a. Structure
   b. Data
   c. Program variety
   d. Evaluation of program review process

http://sloassessment.com – link to program review samples and worksheets

Another meeting—suppose to be at DEVELOPMENT stage right now moving to PROFICIENCY