
Project Overview/Scope: Marjorie provided a brief review of the project and the scope of the advisory committee’s work. She noted that the goal is to accomplish a reasonable draft document that can subsequently be cleaned up into a cohesive document in order to facilitate a mock evaluation in Fall 2010. Roxanne reminded committee members that a project site has been setup in myCR to track and document the work as well as provide a forum for feedback from the CR community.

Project Timeline Update: Roxanne distributed copies of an updated timeline that was revised to provide further opportunity for constituent participation (especially appointed faculty who had only recently been confirmed) and also provide a product that could be submitted to the Academic Senate prior to the last Senate meeting of the Spring 2010 term. Roxanne’s update included one additional meeting (week of April 19) and, at Kevin’s suggestion, one more additional meeting was scheduled during the week of March 22.

A few committee members indicated that expectations about completing a self-study in such a short time period may be overly ambitious. Pam suggested that work throughout the summer may be necessary to produce a quality product. There was some discussion about a practice run versus a polished document. It was suggested that although the timeline may be ambitious, the committee should make an effort to accomplish as much as possible within the project timeline.

ACCJC Self-Study Training: There was some discussion about self-study formation and activities from committee members who had not previously participated in an accreditation self-study. Marjorie indicated that the October 9, 2009 all-day workshop presented by Dr. Jack Pond and Dr. Steve Maradian was a ‘train the trainer’ workshop and, although materials from the workshop are available for sharing, the ACCJC trainers were not prescriptive with respect to how self-study teams should be formed and operated. Roxanne noted that the self-study reports of other colleges generally discussed self-study formation and processes, and Pam suggested it might be good to get more information about the self-study process that took place at American River College.

Updates by Standard: Zach noted that work on the Introduction is progressing as expected. The Standard I work had just begun and there was not much to report. Standard II encompasses a large amount of work, but Keith and Rachel both provided updates indicating that a large amount of preparatory work had already taken place with respect to evidence gathering and outlining. Marla indicated that on the previous Monday she met with Ruth Bettenhausen to review the status of the self-study for Standard III and that other meetings with Mike and Maggie were planned. Marjorie noted that in Ruth’s absence, she and Roxanne would collaborate with Marla to lead the work on Standard III. Steve reported that Geisce, Mark, and he had met to identify tasks and assignments related to Standard IV and that their next meeting was scheduled.
Clarification was made to confirm that references to multi-college districts are not applicable to CR’s self-study.

Closing: Marjorie asked for closing thoughts/comments from each committee member. Maggie noted that the technology resources area had not participated in annual reviews with regularity and that staff members in the technology area had little or no experience with accreditation processes. Maggie asked about the process for folding in other data that has not been gathered yet; Marjorie explained that ongoing revisions will take place in Fall 2010.

Pam suggested that a draft report may develop a certain amount of credibility or inertia, making revisions difficult; she suggested that keeping the report rough initially will help ensure this does not happen.

It was agreed that ‘project timeline’ will be a standing item on committee meeting agendas. The next meeting will be scheduled for March 25, 2010 at 4:00 p.m.
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