Crafton Hills College Accreditation Committee Minutes	Date: October 27, 2010	

Members Present:
Ralph Rabago – Co-chair
Julie Davis-McKee
Jodi Hanley
JoAnn Jones
Farhad Mansourian
Aaron Race
Dan Word

Guests:
Gloria Harrison
Gary Williams

Members Absent:
Cheryl Marshall – Co chair
Damaris Matthews
Robert McAtee
Scott Rippy
Miriam Williams

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
Review and Approval of September 22, 2010 Minutes	Approved by consensus with no changes.	
Experiences on a Visiting Team • Gloria Harrison • Gary Williams	**Gloria Harrison** Preparation before visit? • The Commission sent every member of the team a book on the standards and included in the packet possible questions for each stardard and substandard. • Served on three teams; two with the old standards and one with the new standard. Training is now more focused and more preparation is done ahead of time. The Commission prefers to train team together if possible. • Chair communicated with the team weekly prior to the visit and asked them to read the full accreditation report to get an impression. Was it cohesive? Did the report have one voice? What do you think of the report? Were the questions answered in a logical manner. Is there evidence? • Assigned a standard based on individual experience. Ended up being assigned as the primary on two standards (Governance and Finance) and a secondary on three. • Reviewed successful Self-Studies to prepare for site visit.	

Campus visit and schedule?
- Breakfast meeting (orientation, discussed the schedule for the day), lunch (assisted each other), Dinner meeting (discussed findings, concerns, problem solving, very collaborative. Wrote a draft of the recommendations that was circulated throughout the team for editing.
- Team takes a vote on the recommendations and submits the report to the Commission for final decision.

What did I learn?
- Report should have one voice. A good editor can accomplish this.
- Be specific and clear.
- Everything is evidence based.
- Minutes of meetings should show who is present and absent. If someone is consistently absent (example: student or classified employee) there is not a true represenation of shared governance.
- Document in the narative step-by-step and reference in the narrative where the evidence can be found.
- Make sure you can sustain what is put in place.
- Very intense.
- A lot of work.
- Felt like an auditor instead of a visitor to the campus.

Self-Study impressions?
- To flowery in its narrative.
- Too general.
- Three voices.
- Did not answer the questions.
- All evidence driven. If you can't find it you have to assume the evidence doesn't exist.
- Big holes and not well arranged.
- Had to dig for information and evidence to determine the process.
- Seemed to have a theme throughout report (the journey going through the process).
- Had problem with data driven decision making.

Gary Williams

Overview:
- Ten member team (five faculty, four administrators, one assistant).

Preparation before visit?
- Since he joined two weeks prior to visitation everything was rushed.
- Was not able to attend training.
- Two Homework Assignments:
  1. Overview of Self-Study Report and Prior Actions.
  2. Team member written report template and pre-visit planning.
- Provided a framework for completing the team report.

	Campus visit and schedule? • Monday: Lunch meeting and informal meet and greet at campus. • Tuesday: Interview and Evidence (writing and more writing…), Team room/Hotel. • Wednesday: Evidence and complete drafts of findings/conclusions. Assemble final report and draft recommendations. • Thursday: Finalize/Edit final draft report, finalized recommendations, Exit session. Depart campus. What did I learn? • Culture of Evidence • The process is peer-driven. • Pinpoint areas of concern…habits/recurring patterns rather than the isolated example. • The college needs to have a robust internal discussion about evidence – what, where, and how we use it. • Documentation… if it's not written down, did it happen? Self-Study impressions? • Reasonably well-written, reflected a team approach, linked to evidence, complete in its addressing all the standards and prior recommendations. • Provide electronic version of self-study with in-text hyper-links to the evidence – this is becoming an expectation of many teams. What can we learn? • Send more people to serve on teams – there is no better training than this. • Be complete and accurate in our self-study. • We need to shift our mind-set from one of compliance "Give them what they want!" to one that takes continuous improvement seriously. • Culture of evidence and dialogue. • Read and follow the ACCJC: Guide to Evaluating Institutions. This is a playbook for the team. A means for directing the campus through the self-study process.	
Training Options • Joining Visiting Teams	Jodi Hanley is interested in serving on an accreditation team. Ralph Rabago asked the committee if they hear of anyone that may be interested in serving on a accreditation team to contact him or Cheryl Marshall.	
Time Line for Mid-Term Report and Committee Work (Continued from previous meeting)	After much discussion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of an Internal or External Accreditation Report Writer, the committee is recommending an Internal Writer be hired with the condition that the committee be part of the selection process.	
Review and Discussion of Standard IA: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness	Will be discussed at the next meeting.	
Adjournment		