SDCC ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE  
Meeting of May 4, 2012  
Conference Room B-104  

AGENDA

Attending:  Dotti Cordell, Helen Elias, Robbi Ewell, Paul Greer, Sandra Pesce,  
Minou Spradley,

Rubric Statement 1: Dotti provided updated numbers from TaskStream (number of  
2011-12 courses entered into TaskStream, number of instructional and student  
support programs entered into TaskStream, number of the above with SLOs  
identified and those with on-going assessment).

- We still need (from Mary) the total number of 2011-12 courses that we offered  
in 2011-12.

- Dotti will provide us (before the next meeting) a list of the 87 instructional  
programs and 31 support programs now shown in TaskStream, so we can  
review the list and correct it where necessary (e.g., adding any that are missing,  
deleting any that are not in existence or are not really separate programs from  
something else).

- Mary will work on the Narrative section for this Rubric Statement.

Rubric Statement 2. We reviewed the language and reconfirmed that:

- Dotti and Berta will extract from TaskStream and share with the rest of us  
examples of programs or courses that have completed enough of the total  
process that we can show how they used outcome/results, including examples  
of institutional changes prompted by these outcomes.

- Mary and the deans will review those from Instruction, while Peter and Helen  
will review those from Student Services, and will jointly develop the Narrative  
section for this Rubric Statement.
Rubric Statement 3. We reviewed the language and reconfirmed that:

- Mary will draw from the Master Plan for a portion of the Narrative section.
- Peter will draw from Student Services for the other portion of the Narrative section.

Rubric Statement 4. We reviewed the language and reconfirmed that:

- For the Narrative section, examples cited will be FYE/Title V, changes in the Counseling schedule, Tutoring, Accelerated English, Statway. And others if needed to hit 250 words. Peter, Helen, Mary, the instructional deans as appropriate.

Rubric Statement 5. We reviewed the language and reconfirmed that:

- We will rely on TaskStream. Dotti and Berta can write the description of the system, while they (with Mary, the deans, Helen and Peter) will select examples of assessment reports extracted from the system.

Rubric Statement 6. We reviewed the language and reconfirmed that:

- Ditto: rely on examples from TaskStream, selected by Dotti, Berta, Mary, and the deans. (This Rubric Statement is about curriculum, not support services.)

Rubric Statement 7. We reviewed the language and reconfirmed that:

- We will draw from the catalog, the class schedules, CurricuNet, the website, Blackboard and the most recent student survey for accreditation.

Self-Assessment Narrative. We will say we’re at Proficiency, and for improvements will cite our setting and monitoring the six-year cycle of assessment, along with on-going dialog and assessment of our SLO process as a whole through MPROAC.

Table of Evidence. Peter will compile this from the lead writers as sections get written and submitted.
Next meetings. Peter will ask Desiree to set up scheduled meetings of the workgroup in May, June, July and August.

Peter noted that we need to start developing and dropping in actual verbiage. We can’t simply continue to meet to talk about what needs to be done to complete the report.