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- Kathy Werle, Co-Chair
- Bob Cosgrove, Co-Chair
- Juan Avalos
- Tod Burnett
- Claire Cesareo-Silva
- Caroline Durdella
- Tere Fluegeman
- Carol Hilton
- Denice Inciong
- Jenny Langrell
- Margot Lovett
- Chris McDonald
- Don Mineo
- Blake Stephens
- Tony Teng
- Carol Ziehm
Status

- In January 2012, the ACCJC took action to remove the college from warning and reaffirm our accreditation.
- As part of the regular accreditation process, we are required to complete a Midterm Report on all of the commission recommendations, visiting team recommendations, and college planning agendas.
Timeline

- First draft to college community – August 19
- Feedback from individuals and college constituencies by August 30
- Constituency group approval by September 6
- Second draft to Consultation Council/President for approval – September 10
- Final draft to Board of Trustees for review – September 23
- Due to ACCJC – October 15
The teams recommend that the chancellor develop and implement both a strategic short-term and long-term plan that is inclusive of the planning at the colleges and that this planning structure drive the allocation of district resources for the colleges, Advanced Technology Education Park (ATEP), and the district (I.B.4.).
District Recommendation 2

The teams recommend that the district and the colleges develop and implement a resource allocation model driven by planning that includes all district funds and is open, transparent, and that is widely disseminated and reviewed/evaluated periodically for effectiveness (I.A.1., I.B., III.D.1., III.D.1.b., III.D.1.c., III.D.1.d., III.D.2.b., III.D.3., IV.B.3 c.).
The teams recommend that the college, district administrators, faculty and staff develop a communications process among the entities on key issues of district-wide concern including academic calendar, planning, (ATEP) Advanced Technology Education Park, technology and building priorities (Standards IV.A.2., IV.B.3.).
The teams recommend that the Board of Trustees widely communicate the results of its self evaluation process annually and use this as the basis for improvement (IV.A.5., IV.B.1.g.).
The teams recommend that the Board of Trustees develop a clearly defined policy for a code of ethics which must include dealing with violations of the Board’s code of ethics (III.A.1.d., IV.B.1.h.).
District Recommendation 6

The teams recommend that the district provide a clear delineation of its functional responsibilities, the district level process for decision-making and the role of the district in college planning and decision-making. The district should provide a regular review of district communities, conduct an assessment of the overall effectiveness of services to the college and communicate the results of those reviews (IV.B.3.a., IV.B.3.b., IV.B.3.e., and IV.B.3.f.).
College Recommendation 1

Although the college and its constituent groups have achieved a collegial working relationship with the current president to address issues with a new optimism, the college does not have the same type of relationship with the district leadership and the Board of Trustees.

The team recommends elements from both Recommendation 7 of the 1998 Accreditation Team and Recommendation 6, B and C of the 2004 visiting team that the district and Board of Trustees support the work of the college by:

B. “Creating an environment which ensures greater administrative stability and empowerment at the college” (IV.A.1., IV.A.2., IV.B.2., and IV.B.3.); and

C. “Enhancing the college and district communication structure so that it is clearer to everyone who the responsible party is for making decisions and how those decisions are or will be made.” (IV.A.1., IV.A.2., IV.B.1., IV.B.2., and IV.B.3.).
The team recommends that the college address the need for both maintenance and new facilities funds and use these funds to address the current safety, accessibility and educational needs of the students (III.B.1.a., III.B.1.b).
The team recommends that the commitment to equity and diversity be demonstrated through multiple means including an updated Student Equity Plan and greater faculty involvement on the Equity and Diversity Committee (I.A., I.A.2.d., II.B.3.d., III.A.4., III.A.4.a.).
The team recommends that the faculty have as a component of their evaluation effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes (III.A.1.c.).
The team recommends that a Student Services strategic plan be developed and implemented to address issues including campus accessibility; DSPS separate locations; International Students Office accessibility and visibility; the long wait list for EOPS students; and Information Technology infrastructure, support and training (II.B.3.a., II.B.4.).
Thank you!

For feedback, please contact Bob Cosgrove, Kathy Werle, and Claire Cesareo-Silva at bcosgrove@saddleback.edu; kwerle@saddleback.edu; ccesareosilva@saddleback.edu

Thank you!