

# Crafton Hills College

## Accreditation Committee Minutes

Date: November 10, 2010  
Location: LRC Multipurpose Room

**Members Present:**  
Cheryl Marshall – Co-chair  
Ralph Rabago – Co-chair  
Julie Davis-McKee  
Jodi Hanley  
Aaron Race  
Scott Rippy  
Miriam Williams  
Dan Word

**Members Absent:**  
JoAnn Jones  
Damaris Matthews  
Farhad Mansourian  
Robert McAtee

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
Review and Approval of October 27, 2010 Minutes	Approved by consensus with one correction	
Update on Nov 5 Site Visit	Cheryl reported that the visit went well and positive comments were received on the quantity and quality of work done at the college over the past two years.	
<p>Experiences on a Visiting Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charlie Ng</li> </ul>	<p><u>Preparation Before the Visit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>He participated in a visit to Santa Monica College as a replacement at the last minute and did not receive training with the team.</li> <li>He reviewed the self-study ahead of the visit and focused on the standards he had been assigned to (primarily standard 1, backup on two others) due to the tight time frame.</li> <li>Most members have about a month ahead of time to prepare and he estimated it would take between 20 and 40 hours.</li> <li>Charlie estimated that about 90% of the work should be completed before stepping on campus. His team leader advised members to write their report based on the existing documents and then to make changes during the visit.</li> </ul> <p><u>Site Visit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The team arrived in the early afternoon and met with one another before going to the college.</li> <li>By the late afternoon, the team arrived at the college and spent a couple of hours meeting with the leaders of each standard and asking general questions.</li> <li>Dinner was spent debriefing with the team members.</li> <li>He spent the remainder of the night prepping for the next day.</li> <li>Interviews were used to gather additional information and evidence.</li> <li>The visit is used to verify the credibility of the self-study.</li> <li>Writing is done each evening to update the report based on the site visit.</li> <li>Different team members see things differently and consensus was achieved through discussion.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important to focus on results achieved at the campus to meet the standard and not on the means used. Sometimes, members would focus on the forms or specifics of the process and this had to be dealt with as a team to overcome individual biases and to achieve consensus.</li> <li>• It is a lot of work and very long days during the visit.</li> <li>• Dissenters will show up during the visit to air their issues and concerns. Team members would look for evidence regarding the concerns but recognized that some people had an “ax to grind.”</li> </ul> <p><u>Report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charlie stated that the report was sometimes boring to read because there was too much detail. The college was proud of their accomplishments and did some boasting in the report but did not always address the standard.</li> <li>• Committee members did not judge the writing. If a question wasn’t answered, the team tried to find evidence or answers during the site visit.</li> <li>• There may be more than one writer, but they need to be clear, descriptive, and thorough.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Lessons Learned / Advice</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charlie definitely recommends that all members of the committee and anyone assigned to write go on a site visit. He stated that having a “critical mass” of members will allow for meaningful discussion.</li> <li>• Most teams include 2-3 faculty and sometimes Board Members.</li> <li>• Participants on visiting teams learn from one another about how they are meeting standards.</li> </ul>	
<p>Lessons Learned at CIO conference</p>	<p>President of ACCJC, Barbara Beno, stated that the commission is not a training organization, but an evaluative one. As a result, CIOs will set up sessions and process for learning from each other and sharing examples.</p> <p>Cheryl distributed handouts she received regarding the use of data and a diagram from another college showing integrated planning.</p>	

<p>Selection Process for Report Writer</p>	<p>Committee members discussed the process to use for selecting an internal report writer. The following was agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A subcommittee will be formed with members of the committee who volunteer; if all areas of the college are not represented, the VPs of Student Services and Administrative Services or their designees will be invited to serve on the subcommittee.</li> <li>• The “opening” will be announced campus wide.</li> <li>• The subcommittee will consider the following minimum qualifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written communication – ability to prepare, edit and finalize lengthy documents</li> <li>• Oral communication – ability to present key ideas and listen to feedback</li> <li>• Demonstrated initiative and ability to follow through on assignments in a timely manner</li> <li>• Analytical skills for critical review of evidence and written documents</li> <li>• Interpersonal skills – ability to work effectively with the campus community</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Interested persons will need to submit samples of written work.</li> <li>• The subcommittee will meet before the end of the year to flesh out the selection process and make preparations for its work in January.</li> <li>• Recommendations (names) will be forwarded to the President for final selection.</li> </ul>	
<p>Review of Spring Tasks</p>	<p>Once the Commission’s decision is issued, we will know what type of report is required for Oct 2011 and tasks can be determined at that time.</p>	
<p>Review and Discussion of Standard IA: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness</p>	<p>Postponed to future meeting</p>	
<p>Other Business <b>Next Meeting: January 26</b></p>		