

---

# ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

---

**Coast Community College District**  
**Regular Meeting of the Accreditation Committee**  
**Date: February 2, 2009 3:30 p.m.**  
**Board of Trustees Office Conference Room**  
**1370 Adams Avenue, Costa Mesa, CA 92626**

## **Procedural Matters**

1. Call to Order – 3:30 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hornbuckle at 3:30 PM.

2. In Attendance – Chair Mary Hornbuckle, Vice Chair Lorraine Prinsky, Acting Chancellor and Coastline College President Ding-Jo Currie, Orange Coast College President Robert V. Dees, Golden West College President Wes Bryan, Orange Coast College Academic Senate President Eduardo Arismendi-Pardi and, Manager of Board Operations/Assistant to the Chancellor Christian Teeter.

3. Public Comment

There were no requests from the Public to address the Committee.

4. Approval of Minutes

The Committee approved the Minutes of the January 15, 2009 Accreditation Committee Meeting.

5. College Accreditation Reports

- a. Orange Coast College
- b. Golden West College
- c. Coastline Community College

The Committee discussed the accreditation reports. Dr. Ding-Jo Currie noted that Coastline College did not have a lot of the recommendations in the report. Dr. Currie noted that a major concern was that the college Library did not have enough resource offerings for their students. The college, in response, had worked within its budget committee in terms of allocating resources for the Library. The college, in its progress report to the accrediting commission, advised of these changes, and they were well received. The writing of this progress report reiterated what they had presented to them during the previous progress report.

Trustee Prinsky asked if any of the resource allocations and planning had more to do with full time faculty, and the issue of part time and full time faculty levels. Dr. Currie

---

noted that Coastline has a process in how it identifies faculty needs. She noted that Coastline does not have this document in any written format – there is no process documented for hiring of positions. So, the staffing plan assists in how the college looks at faculty vacancies and how they are hired. Dr. Prinsky wanted to know if it is a concern. Dr. Currie indicated that it was a concern. Dr. Currie noted that they are proud of the staffing plan and that it was a great exercise for the college.

Dr. Currie spoke regarding policy of the delineation of District and College functions. In terms of #10, she spoke about the input of former Interim Associate Vice Chancellor Joyce Black. Dr. Currie noted that Ms. Black had worked with the colleges and the Board to approve the policy. Dr. Currie spoke about the various boundaries and the roles and responsibilities of the Board, Chancellor, and College Presidents. Dr. Currie feels that this recommendation should be fully addressed. Dr. Currie noted that the Board's role, citing the Accreditation Committee, as well as the Board's participation in drafting the new policy on delineation of functions, is another indication of the Board's involvement and seeing it as very important for the District.

Mr. Robert Dees discussed the OCC status report and noted that Ms. Felts, who is writing the report, is obtaining feedback in hopes that the draft report will be finalized. He noted that there was pressure on the timeline. Ms. Hornbuckle noted that it was asked in advance given the great concern on the part of the Board Members about the accreditation issues. Mr. Dees noted that they made great strides in the Fall with all of those recommendations and was impressed with the campus' efforts.

Mr. Dees spoke about Recommendation 1, on Page 4, Student Learning Outcomes. He said that there is a large number of course outlines finished, due to a lot of work on the part of the faculty and the college's curriculum committee. The committee held workshops and provided trainings. Ms. Hornbuckle had a question, whether they "can obtain SLOs" – but perhaps it should say "will obtain SLOs." She noted the "can" to be changed to "will", to advise the commission that it will be done. Mr. Dees noted that OCC is unique in the District that it requires a syllabus with SLOs to student. Mr. Dees noted that every instructional program has identified and published SLOs. They will be in next year's counseling and the course catalog. He noted that the college also spent time defining terms, which was helpful to the organization.

On Page 5 of the Orange Coast College report, Mr. Dees, commented as of February 13, programs will have submitted a Mission Statement and a PSLO. Mr. Dees noted that these processes are complicated, but people are cooperating and working to complete them.

Overall, Mr. Dees feels good that they are this far along. Ms. Hornbuckle asked about the completion of the requirements for the commission. Mr. Dees confirmed that all colleges must have SLOs fully implemented by 2012. Mr. Dees commented that the college is ahead of schedule on this, and is on schedule with the PSLOs.

Mr. Dees noted that the accreditation efforts are also related to Student Services. For the college, one challenge was that people had different processes – so the college wanted to standardize them. Student Services had a very good program review – the college made a model that fits all four wings at the college ...program review would be consistent across the college.

Mr. Dees spoke about Item D on Page 7. He noted that the college had more work to do on this issue. Mr. Dees wanted to demonstrate everything else that they had been doing could result in an assessment being done. Ms. Hornbuckle asked if there was a target date – Mr. Dees stated that at least half the college should be done by the time a mid-term report is filed with the accrediting commission.

Mr. Dees commented that the college has had good “buy in” from the faculty and other units of the college as well throughout the review process.

On Page 10 of the report, Mr. Dees commented about the second recommendation, and the issue of program review. He noted that the college has overhauled the process and has instituted a student learning outcome committee which will be a “watchdog” for accreditation and SLO process. Mr. Dees commented that if, for example, the admin service wing identified a staffing need, they would recommend to Planning and Budget that staffing was a huge process on campus.

Mr. Dees spoke about Recommendation #3, concerning Planning, on Page 16. He noted that the biggest challenge is to do long range planning. They tend to plan year to year – and revamped their program review and planning document to push themselves into a longer range of time. One of the things that they have done, and this relates to Human Resources Planning on Page 17, they were not happy with their hiring processes on the campus. They tended to rank and hire faculty one time per year.

Mr. Dees noted that since the first accreditation visit in March 2007, the college has changed the way that it conducts hiring. It hires Classified three times per year, and hires Faculty one time per year. They have also established hiring rubrics. This has improved the overall process. They have only been on the classified process for a year now, and it has been a real learning process for the campus. Mr. Dees noted that the college uses its master plan, and they have had to make adjustments and how they support various positions on the campus.

Mr. Dees spoke about two concerns raised by the commission, going to page 25 of the status report. Again, related to SLOs, he emphasized that the college is on tract to address this. All courses have outlines, and all certificate programs will have PSLOs completed. As far as publishing the outlines, they will be made available to students and the public, online and in the course catalog. There would also be syllabi included with SLOs.

Mr. Dees commented on the establishment of a Transparency Committee to address a recommendation to improve transparency across the campus. Mr. Dees noted that the issue was being dealt effectively across the campus. Dr. Arismendi-Pardi discussed various issues of transparency across the campus and issues of transparency addressed by the Academic Senate’s Transparency Committee. Dr. Prinsky asked Dr. Arismendi-Pardi for more background. Dr. Arismendi-Pardi commented that issues of transparency related to assignments of faculty, and that the process was handled in a way such that the process used for those assignments could be questioned. Decisions could be made hastily for issues like release time. He noted that the issue arose well before the accreditation team’s visit.

Mr. Bryan discussed the GWC accreditation report. He noted that several different groups worked on this report and that there is an institutional effectiveness committee. He noted that these worked on Recommendation #5 and the concern rose. There was a student equity committee to deal with the student equity issue, and they collaborated with the former Associate Vice Chancellor.

In terms of Recommendation #5, unlike many institutions, President Bryan noted that the college does program review for every program in all wings every two years. If they will tie program review to planning and budgeting, then you would be comparing a program

review this year. They go through a program review cycle. Mr. Bryan discussed a template that has a curriculum inventory worksheet, with a goal of reviewing every course each six years. Mr. Bryan addressed that assessments have been developed for all courses, that there are SLOs on every course, and they have them developed for each of the majors and career programs.

In terms of Recommendation #7, Mr. Bryan noted that the report provided activities that had been completed. He also noted that the Student Equity Committee had formulated goals and is ready to look into other areas.

Mr. Bryan commented on Recommendation #16, on Page 10. This is similar to OCC's concern, except that the commission is saying that the SLOs were not published. Mr. Bryan noted that in the future, whenever a course is researched on the District's Banner system, the SLOs will be listed for that course. In addition, with the electronic version of the college's course catalog, Mr. Bryan noted that features within Banner could be leveraged to make this change.

Dr. Prinsky commented on the new status of the committee and requested input on how the committee will be involved in the process. Ms. Hornbuckle commented that the committee meets only when it needs to meet. Dr. Currie suggested that when a Team visit is scheduled, a good idea would be to brief the committee on how well prepared the colleges are to meet with the team. She noted that the team would most likely be meeting with the Accreditation Committee. Mr. Bryan noted that there is a "mid-term" report due as well later in the process, which expands on the progress reports that are due to the commission in March.

Ms. Hornbuckle emphasized that this committee would not meet monthly but would be convened when the need arises.

Ms. Hornbuckle commented that she would address deadlines with the Board, in terms of when the reports are provided to Trustees. Mr. Dees confirmed that all reports were to the accrediting commission on March 1, 2009.

6. Review of Board of Trustees' Policy: Accreditation Committee

No action was reported.

7. Discussion of Future Meeting Dates

The Committee discussed future meeting dates. Dr. Currie advised that the committee meetings in the near future could be determined by accrediting commission visit schedules.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Hornbuckle adjourned the meeting at 4:06 P.M