

# Summary of Accreditation Self-Evaluation Process Development

(As presented by Accreditation Steering Committee at Accreditation Organizational Meetings)

- **Rationale behind development of 2016 Accreditation Self-Evaluation process and timeline**
  - Addresses ACCJC concerns of 2010 Accreditation Self-Study report: *“the team felt that the narrative was unnecessarily lengthy”*
  - Addresses concerns of previous faculty-editors, as well as previous tri-chairs:
    - Lack of work for editor early in writing process
    - Editor’s difficulty in consolidating multiple writing team voices/narratives into one voice/narrative
    - Difficulty in getting multiple writing teams to meet deadlines
  - Meets district and accreditation deadlines

# Summary of Accreditation Self-Evaluation Process Development

(As presented by Accreditation Steering Committee at Accreditation Organizational Meetings)

## Summary of proposed 2016 Self-Evaluation Process and Timeline

Tri-Chair Roles	Steering Committee (ALO and Faculty Co-Chair) Roles
Identify evidence to address the standards.	Coordinate with tri-chair groups as they prepare evidence to meet the standards.
Collaborate with additional faculty, staff and administrators to provide evidence.	Receive submitted grid write-ups and start to compile and produce initial narrative By February 2015
Submit write-ups of evidence that meet standards in grid format (bullets are preferred but narratives are not excluded) February 2015	Submit initial narrative to tri-chairs for feedback and continued collaboration to create first draft for campus circulation April 2015
Review initial narrative draft prepared by Steering Committee for content and accuracy and give feedback in order to create first draft for campus circulation April- August 2015	Continuous “production, circulation, and modification” of narrative drafts with college-wide input Public Forum 1 September 2015 Public Forum 2 November 2015 Public Forum 3 February 2016

# Summary of Accreditation Self-Evaluation Process Development

(As presented by Accreditation Steering Committee at Accreditation Organizational Meetings)

- **Addressing Senate points of concern:**
  - Provides ample opportunity for faculty input and “voice”
  - Creates collaborative environment for all constituencies to work together on the college-wide process of self-evaluation
  - Does not necessarily exclude a faculty editor at later stages of draft development.
  - **If editor is deemed necessary, it minimizes the work-load for editor by creating a single-voice narrative for editing purposes only**