

ACCREDITATION NOTES





Oct. 2009 Issue 3

*An Update on the Mt. San Antonio College
Accreditation Self-Study*

The Self-Study Draft Is Ready For Your Review!

After a year of hard work by the Accreditation Self-Study Standard Teams, the draft of Mt. SAC's Self-Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation is ready for the campus community's feedback. The draft will be made available in both hard copy and electronic formats (please see the reverse of this newsletter for access information). We invite all of you to review all or portions of the Self-Study and to submit comments. Hearing what the Mt. SAC community thinks about the manner in which the College is meeting the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College's standards is one of the most important parts of the Accreditation process. Having participation from each constituency group is vital in our efforts to have widespread participation.

As you learned in the previous Accreditation Notes newsletter, http://www.mtsac.edu/administration/accreditation/newsletters/2009-03_newsletter.pdf, the Self-Study is divided into four standards:
Standard I—Institutional Mission and Effectiveness,
Standard II—Student Learning Programs and Services, **Standard III—Resources,**



and **Standard IV—Leadership and Governance.** Each substandard within the Self-Study is evaluated in three ways: (1) a descriptive summary that springs from institutional dialogue and is focused on supporting evidence, (2) a self-evaluation that articulates what the college has learned about itself in terms of the standards, and (3) a planning agenda that expresses a vehicle for institutional improvement.

We would like employees from all constituencies to review one or more of the standards that fall within their service areas. The leaders of each constituency group are responsible for providing feedback in conjunction with their constituents. One way to organize this process for constituency groups is to encourage each constituency leader to bring together key people to review and discuss those parts of the Self-Study that are relevant to each group. For Managerial Teams and/or departments, you might consider the scope of this project and come to a consensus as to how to look at the document and provide feedback. You, as individuals, can also provide feedback, not as members of any of the defined groups. Feel free to ask **Kristina Allende** for input on which parts might be of interest for your group to review.



ACCREDITATION NOTES

For this feedback process, you and/or your group need to be selective and strategic when deciding the parts of the Self-Study upon which you should focus. Since the document is large, it may not be efficient for each person to read the document in its entirety. The focus of the review should be on the content of the document, not on the grammar at this time. We will fix the grammar in December and January. The process of reviewing should be one that is collegial, collaborative, and completed with integrity. Guiding questions to help you in presenting the findings of your review are provided in the next column.

Your and/or your group's feedback needs to be received by the Self-Study co-chairs, **Kristina Allende** and/or **Barbara McNeice-Stallard**, no later than **Monday, November 30, 2009**.

(kallende@mtsac.edu or research@mtsac.edu or via campus mail).

The electronic copy of the Self-Study draft is located at: http://www.mtsac.edu/administration/accreditation/2010self_study.html

If you would like a paper copy, please contact **Kristina Allende** at kallende@mtsac.edu or at ext. 5751.



DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY:

Originates from institutional dialogue (*i.e.*, back and forth communication) and is focused on supporting evidence (*i.e.*, documents such as reports, minutes, research, etc.).

- Does the summary represent what you think the College is doing to meet the standard? Why or why not?
- Do you “buy” the response (*i.e.*, *does it make sense, cover all of the work the college has done to adequately represent the truth of the college's work*)? What about the response works or doesn't work?
- Is there enough evidence (*e.g.*, *documents, minutes, reports*) to support the statements about the College's activities? What evidence is strongest? What missing evidence can be included?

SELF-EVALUATION:

States what the College has learned about itself in terms of the standards.

- Based on the standard, what has the College learned about itself?
- Are all pieces of the standard being met? To what degree does the evidence demonstrate that the College is meeting the standard? Why?
- The analysis should result in actionable conclusions (*i.e.*, *areas in need of change*). Does it? Why or why not?
- Do you think the college meets or doesn't meet the standard?

PLANNING AGENDA:

Expresses a vehicle for institutional improvement.

- If a planning agenda is included, what is its strength?
- Are the included planning agendas “do-able”? Will they result in improvement?
- If the standard is met and no planning agenda is included, does the evidence prove that one is not needed? How?