LOCATION: Altos (Room 2019)
TIME: 2:00PM – 4:00PM

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Amanda Kolstad, Andrea Hanstein, Elaine Kuo, Jennifer Sinclair, Josh Westling, Simon Pennington, & Teresa Zwack.

GUESTS:
Ruby Sodhi

I) Introductions
Andrea welcomed the newly formed team members and informed them of her new role as a Team Leader on this Standard I accreditation self-study. She also informed the members that Andrew LaManque is the Accreditation Liaison Officer. Members also briefly introduced themselves and provided information on any past experience in serving on accreditation team/s. Andrea provided everyone a list of all the members who are serving on this team (see Appendix A). She encouraged members to invite colleagues who may also be a good fit to serve on this team.

II) Committee Roles & Expectations
Andrea informed the members that because the Tri-chair model used during the last accreditation self-study cycle (in 2011) did not work well, four team leaders have been formed for the four standards for the college’s upcoming re-accreditation in 2017. She noted that the four teams would provide an open and collaborative process for the re-accreditation of the college. She provided everyone a handout of the proposal of the new structure of the self-study teams that was approved by PaRC in spring 2016 (see Appendix B). The accreditation self-study team leaders are:
   1. Andrea Hanstein – Standard I (Mission, Academic Quality, & Institutional Effectiveness, & Integrity)
   2. Carolyn Holcroft – Standard II (Student Learning Programs & Support Services)
   3. Erin Ortiz – Standard III (Resources)
   4. Andrew LaManque – Standard IV (Leadership & Governance)

Andrea also provided an outline of the Accreditation Steering Committee and its oversight responsibility to support and guide the work of the four teams. The Accreditation Steering Committee members are Andrew LaManque, Andrea Hanstein, Carolyn Holcroft, and Erin Ortiz. Ruby provides support for all accreditation related activities including each self-study team. Andrea outlined the roles and expectations for members who have volunteered to serve on this team based on ACCJC’s Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation. Andrea encouraged everyone to have a focused approach to this work and to consider the positives in addition to identifying the challenges/weaknesses as evidence (both qualitative and quantitative) for the self-study.
III) Accreditation Standards & Institutional Expectations
Andrea provided everyone a handout on Standard I from the ACCJC’s website on Accreditation Standards and encouraged everyone to read and understand them. Andrea also shared a PowerPoint presentation about accreditation kick-off at Foothill College in February 2016. Andrea informed members about a new addition to this self-study report - Quality Focused Essay that will be provided by the college to the Commission as one of the new requirements. Ruby shared that information about the self-study teams (including meeting minutes) and accreditation related work will be posted on Foothill College’s website soon.

IV) Accreditation Timeline
Andrea shared a handout on Accreditation Self-Study Timeline (see Appendix C). There was discussion around the frequency of meetings in summer and fall 2016. Andrea also informed the members that the Accreditation Steering Committee might look into the possibility of organizing a training session through the ACCJC this fall for those who could benefit from it. There was discussion around organizing forums in the college this fall as part of gathering and sharing information for the self-study. Elaine informed everyone that the accreditation surveys to students and staff are ready to be sent out soon from the Office of Instruction.

V) Key Components of Self Study Teams
Andrea provided handouts to members about the key components of self-study teams for members to consider (see Appendix D). She encouraged everyone to identify core themes (e.g. student success, SLO’s institutional commitments, etc.) and share data widely as part of gathering and organizing evidence. There was discussion around what sources of evidence to collect and how to identify the institution’s gaps and accomplishments. Members agreed to conduct a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis (see Appendix E).

I) Next Steps
All the members agreed to gather one piece of evidence for discussion at the next meeting.
## Accreditation Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce McLeod</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Tam</td>
<td>PSME</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Morris</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Westling</td>
<td>Bio Health</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Pitts</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Kuo</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Wolf</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanette Solvason</td>
<td>Bio Health</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Sinclair</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Palma</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lu</td>
<td>Veterans + DRC</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam White</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Flores</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Tovar</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Fong</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Zwick</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Escamilla</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Pennington</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Kolstad</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Hanstein</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Proposal to PaRC on the Organization of the Accreditation Self Study Teams

Proposal to PaRC on the Organization of the Accreditation Self Study Teams
April 14, 2016
Draft for PaRC Discussion

I. Accreditation Steering Committee
   a. A total of 4 members
   b. Academic Senate, Classified Senate, AOL, Marketing and Communications (Carolyn, Erin, Andrew, Andrea)
   c. Act as leads for each of the 4 self-study teams
   d. Work to develop consistency across teams – training, approach to data analysis, approach to dividing up the work, similar due dates
   e. Meet weekly or bi-weekly as needed starting spring 2016
   f. Other issues for Steering Committee discussion
      i. Quality Focused Essay
      ii. District Standards
      iii. Accreditation Survey
      iv. District / College Functional Map
      v. Development of timeline for teams
      vi. Communications

II. Self-Study Teams
   a. Volunteers needed!
   b. Previous experience not required!
   c. Not necessary to contribute as a writer – discussion and input is key
   d. Steering Committee members will act as “leads” – (no tri-chairs)
   e. Meet 2 times in spring 2016 and then more often (as necessary) in fall 2016 and winter 2017
### Appendix C: Foothill College Accreditation Self Study Timeline

# Foothill College Accreditation Self Study Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter '16</th>
<th>Spring '16</th>
<th>Fall '16</th>
<th>Winter '17</th>
<th>Spring '17</th>
<th>Fall '17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off*</td>
<td>Self Study Teams begin work: Accreditation Survey conducted by IRP (students and employees)</td>
<td>Teams complete first draft</td>
<td>Campus identifies QFE topics</td>
<td>Submit Self Study to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>ACCJC Site Team Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize and train self study teams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teams use Survey Data</td>
<td>Continue to incorporate campus feedback; finalize self study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PaRC tri-chairs and ACCJC training attendees
Appendix D: Key Components of Self Study Teams

**Key Components of Self-Study Teams**

- Engage stakeholders in a reflective and structured dialogue and examination of the programs/services.
- Focus on standards and evidence.
- Gather and organize data and analyses (program reviews, assessment reports, SLO data, student achievement data, demographic studies, environmental scan data).
- Use predictors on social and cultural trends (with support from IR).
- Meet regularly to develop the work in addressing the standard.
- Ensure integration of data and processes.
- Attend trainings, webinars, presentations, or other resource opportunities for guidance about preparing the Self Study report.
- Identify core themes (e.g. student success, SLOs, institutional commitments, dialogue, organization, institutional integrity, etc.)
- Refer to institutional reports (previous accreditation reports: self study, midterm, annual fiscal progress, substantive change reports, team reports, commission action letters), and institutional plans (education, facilities, financial, technology, and human resources).
- Set deadlines for all assigned activities in the Self Study process.
- Employ qualitative and quantitative measures.