



ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011
Board Room, 7:30 a.m.

1. **Call to Order**

Sandra Hamilton Slane called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

Present:

Brad Banghart

Bill Cochran

Debbie Goodman

Sandra Hamilton Slane

Matt Hoffman

Doug Manning

Deb Parisot

Lisa Stearns

Ramon Tello

Absent:

Nancy deHalas, John Livingston, Ralph Perrin, Researcher

Guest:

Doug Meline

2. **Discussion / Action**

- a. Approval of Minutes from November 17, 2010

Motion to approve: Parisot/Hoffman. The motion carried unanimously.

3. **Update on Meeting with Standard Chairs**

Sandra said Doug Meline would be joining the meeting about 7:45 to explain how those results of the faculty/staff survey will be provided to the standard chairs and sub-chairs.

Deb said she met with her committee and Doug has apparently shared the information with some people. Somehow Nancy Funk and two other committee members were given the information. Deb said it was embarrassing that she didn't have the results when others had already been provided with the information. Bill said nothing was supposed to have gone out across campus yet. When it does, it will go out of the President's office. Deb said it apparently went out to a few people and then Nancy shared it with her whole staff. Bill said Doug may have sent it out for some feedback before putting it in final form. There was discussion in Cabinet this week regarding the timing of releasing the results.

Sandra said she, Brad and John met with the standard chairs in December. There was full attendance and participation. The chairs were very pleased to meet with the three of them and it

seemed to help clarify the role of the chairs and sub-chairs and also confirmed the support from this committee. They expressed that it would have been helpful to have the meeting earlier in the process.

Brad said in his subsequent meetings with chairs and sub-chairs, they wanted to make sure their energies are on the right track. The people that are actively engaged want to make sure they are doing what they should be doing.

Bill said a concern was expressed by some of the chairs that the initial deadline was too early. The response back to them was we didn't think so. What if we had a later deadline and were just starting this process now? This gives time to clarify thinking and fill the holes of what is needed to complete the process.

Deb said she thinks her group over analyzed things because they were new. They struggled with it in the beginning but now they realized that Frank and Lucha will rewrite it as necessary. They wanted it to be perfect right away and that wasn't what was needed.

It was noted that the second draft is due to this committee this month. Sandra said she will send a notice to the chairs about the second draft due date.

4. Update on Survey Data

Doug distributed a memo dated 12/17/2010 together with the survey list of statements. Sandra asked if this information could be disseminated. Doug said, at this point, it is only for the committee to review. Cabinet has already reviewed and discussed it. Once it is ready for distribution, it will go out from the President's Office.

The response rankings are split into the following headings: full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, instructional faculty, classified, administration, all employees. Doug went on to explain how to read the rankings. For example, the #1 item of importance for faculty was statement #70, adjunct faculty #71, classified staff #26, etc. The column on the right side provides the information to refer back to the previous survey.

Doug went on to say it is probably more interesting to look at the gap. The gap is measuring the difference between how important you think a statement is and the level of agreement or disagreement. If there is a negative gap, it means agree with the statement but don't think it is very important. There are a few negative gaps for every group.

Sandra asked the committee members to review this as soon as possible so that any concerns can be forwarded to Doug. Doug said this is not technically an analysis but, instead, a grouping based on the rankings. This gives the standard committee members information as they do the analysis for their standards. Doug said Gary will send this information out to the campus community once he gets the go-ahead from this group.

Doug noted that the student survey information is not yet in this format but it is being worked on.

Doug said, once we have a researcher on board, he would think the gaps are probably where they will focus their attention. Bill asked if this is it a one-way analysis of the gap. Doug said you would have to take a look at the importance level. He asked if Bill wants to see high importance and high gap. Bill responded that quick reference would be helpful information to understand what people see as important but not being addressed. Doug said he would add that information and send out an update.

Bill said both ends of that spectrum are important. What do we think is important and doing well and not well. It will help in the focus of our future efforts and planning.

Doug said the first thing he did was look at the top ten gaps for each group to see where there were disparities in perceptions.

Sandra said, in looking at the classified group, almost none of their gaps are for what they consider of highest importance. That would indicate they see things in a positive light.

Doug Manning asked if they had the percent of each group responding? Doug Meline responded the count for each response is listed for each question. The sample on the cover page shows that there were 84 individuals (instructional only field) who responded to the importance of a statement, but only 77 responded to the agreement of that statement. That indicates that everyone who started the survey didn't complete it. Trying to do a percentage when we are not validating it is difficult.

Doug said we got a very reasonable response rate to this survey. For a typical survey, if you get 20% you are doing well. When we crossed the 40% response rate, it is a very good response rate.

Sandra asked about the write-in comments at the end. Doug responded those will not be distributed. They will keep the public aspect of the survey to the fill-in-the-bubble portion. There were only 11 write-in comments made.

Debbie asked if there are comments on the student survey, will those be sent to the appropriate departments. Doug responded that if there is something that addresses a problem then, yes, we inform the appropriate individual so that action can be taken. That is very rare.

Doug said now that we have gathered the information the next step will be to identify the top gaps and develop focus groups. We should have a couple of focus groups for faculty for key areas, for classified, etc. You have to have some mechanism to validate the information.

Ramon said on some of these there is nothing we can do because of the economy. There are others that can be addressed.

Doug said that as soon as this committee gives its ok on the information provided, it will be distributed by the President's Office.

5. Announcements

Next scheduled meetings: February 23 and March 23 at 7:30 a.m. in the Board Room

6. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn: Parisot/Tello. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8: 25 a.m.