



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Accreditation Work “Party”
Wednesday, April 05, 2017
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: President’s Conference Room (1901)
TIME: 9:00AM – 1:00PM
FACILITATOR: Andrew LaManque, *Interim Vice President of Instruction & Institutional Research*
GUESTS: Kevin Harral, Rachele Campbell, Bret Watson, Erin Ortiz, Judy Baker, Simon Pennington, Lori Silverman, Craig Gawlick, Lisa Ly, Teresa Ong, Rosa Nguyen, Josh Pelletier, Kurt Hueg, Mike Mohebbi, Lan Truong, Casie Wheat, Andrea Hanstein, Katherine Fortune, Kamara Tramble, Carolyn Holcroft, Denise Swett, Paul Starer, Andrew LaManque, Elaine Kuo

Participants convened to review the self-study draft, identify the remaining gaps, and resolve any questions remaining about the Standards or self-study format. After the initial group meeting, participants were broken out by each of based on the four Standards.

The group reconvened around noon for a progress update:

Standard IA: The college mission statement process meets the Standard but there should be a stronger connection discussing about how the mission drives planning. More evidence will be needed to document this discussion. The mission statement review and revision process follows the institutional six year planning calendar, but alignment with the Educational Master Plan update process appears less connected.

Standard IB: There is copious evidence that the college meets this Standard, but about half of the narrative in this section needs to be drafted in the coming week. Graphics demonstrating college governance and institutional planning and budget prioritization processes will also be updated with support from Marketing so that these can be approved by the Planning and Resource Council (PaRC) for inclusion in the self-study. There are some gaps in the existing governance structure that will need to be addressed when crafting the QFEs.

Standard IC: Roughly half of this section will need to be revised even though the college meets the Standard. Discussion occurred regarding the interpretation of this Standard, and efforts will be made to ensure that evidence to the Standard is the primary focus—that the institution is documenting, describing and communicating to all (internal and external) constituents.

Standard IIA: The text for this section appears fairly complete.

Standard IIB: The text for this section appears fairly complete, but there is a need for editing of language, tone and style.

Standard IIC: This section is missing, even though text was previously provided.

Standard IIIA: The section is completed, in editing stage.

Standard IIIB: Section was reviewed, in editing stage, where focus will be on providing more information and explanation of evidence.

Standard IIIC: The section is completed, in editing stage.

Standard IIID: The section is completed, in editing stage.

Standard IVA-D: This section is completed, in editing stage. The group discussed the value of identifying evidence through quotes and examples in contrast to simply citing the evidence. Much of the narrative focus is on communication and less on the process.

In general, concern was expressed regarding the evidence referenced and whether the URL links will be accurate. The college will need to review all evidence will be accessible as well as current.

Discussion regarding ensuring support for those individuals who will be tasked to bring the document together and ensuring that the narrative has one shared voice.

The group was reminded that as the Town Hall meetings will begin in Wednesday, April 26, a draft will need to be available for campus review and feedback. All edits and sections will need to be completed before that date. The self-study will be discussed and approved through the participatory governance process in May, culminating in Board approval in June.

The group agreed by consensus that updates regarding processes or procedures occurring in the upcoming spring term will be limited, ensuring the focus for the remainder of the academic year remains on finalizing the self-study.