



ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Wednesday, June 15, 2011
Board Room, 9:00 a.m.

1. **Call to Order**

Sandra called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. Quorum confirmed.

Present:

Marc Beam
Nancy deHalas
Debbie Goodman
Deb Parisot

Ralph Perrin
Sandra Slane
Lisa Stearns

Absent:

Brad Banghart
Doug Manning
Ramon Tello

2. **Discussion / Action**

- a. Approval of Minutes from May 18, 2011

Motion to approve: Parisot/Stearns

Sandra noted that Doug Manning was absent at the May 18 meeting.

The motion to approve with correction carried unanimously.

3. **Annual Review of Steering Committee By-Laws**

Sandra said the copy attached to the agenda is the most recent draft. Sandra noted the evaluation process is a discussion item later on the agenda.

Sandra thinks the "Note" on the Committee Membership page is somewhat confusing. Ralph said it could say the faculty co-chair will be elected. Sandra said the liaison officer could serve as one of the two co-chairs. Sandra said they could leave it for this year and look at it again next year once a new VP is in place.

Motion to adopt the revised By-Laws: Parisot/Beam.

Ralph commented that it doesn't read correctly, even for this year. After a brief discussion it was agreed that the "Note" could be deleted.

The Motion was amended to delete the “Note” at the bottom of the Committee Membership page: Parisot/Perrin

The motion carried with the above change.

4. Update on Drafts and Standards Debriefing Meetings

Sandra said there were four debriefing meetings. She was pleased with the turnout and participation. The Standard 4 group was particularly talkative and gave a lot of input and suggestions for the future.

The editors now have the drafts and they have gotten through a good portion of the material and are being very concise. The standard chairs are also working on imbedding links, etc. It is coming out very clean.

College Council has a special meeting scheduled for 9 a.m. on June 30. They will have about 8 days to read through the document prior to their meeting. When Sandra sends it to them she will be sending some guidelines on how to read it.

Sandra noted that there was a planning agenda work session with about 12 people last week. They looked at the planning agendas for each of the standards and were able to condense them into six or eight themes. They are very succinct and concise statements of our planning agenda, which is different from the last accreditation. We are going to come up with a thematic list with more global issues. Marc said College Council will get those along with the self study.

Sandra said she presented the annual update to the Board on Wednesday night. Her goal was to inform the Board of where we are in the process and to explain their involvement with the visiting team. When she sends the draft to College Council on Monday, she will send it to the Board as well. When it is placed on the Board agenda, they take action to accept it – they don't approve it. They will discuss it later at their Board Retreat so they are more prepared to meet with the site visit team.

Sandra has been working with the President's office to make sure the necessary documentation is available online or through Docushare. We want to make it as logical and easy as possible for our visiting team.

Sandra said there are about 12 elements to the draft and the standards are just one of them. She is working with Marc on the others. She created a spreadsheet so that we have every required element listed to make sure we don't miss anything.

Sandra noted that the faculty editors are very committed to striking a balance between providing an honest assessment but also preparing us to be accredited. Cathy Anderson and Susan Meacham are reading it from an insider's perspective of commitment but also from an honest perspective.

5. Steering Committee Membership

Shelly Presnell has agreed to replace John Livingston as the second faculty member. Sandra also spoke with Michael Pratt about getting a replacement for the student rep next year. She discussed with Michael the idea of having workshops for students to help them understand and be prepared for the site visit.

6. Steering Committee Annual Update

Sandra already reviewed it but wanted to make sure the Committee had a copy.

7. Committee Self-Evaluation

Sandra said an evaluation process of this committee needs to be developed. The only notes she kept from the debriefing meetings were the suggestions made. She would like to have a conversation here about how to collect some of our reflections and suggestions for our process. We need systematic feedback that is more than just an around-the-table discussion.

Ralph said it is important to look at the experiences of those who participated on a subcommittee as compared to those who did not. He finds his role as a subcommittee chair fades into his role on this committee. From those that did not serve on a subcommittee, their viewpoint of this committee and what we got done would be valuable. Lisa said she felt very disconnected with the process. It is her understanding that the role of this committee is to steer the process, set timelines, and assist, if needed. Debbie Goodman said coming here was an extension of the writing she did for her standard.

Sandra said the overall role of the standard chairs was blurry. Marc said in his previous experience, the standard chairs were the lead for writing, and it was pretty much the opposite here. He doesn't know if that was the intention or just the way it happened. Sandra said the co-chair role was not clearly defined and sometimes it matched what people expected and other times it didn't. We need to identify descriptions of the different positions - chair, writers, committee members, etc.

Lisa said the training at the very beginning would have been very beneficial for the chairs and the writers. She is not sure those individuals got that. Ralph said his experience, like Marc's, is a bit different. He wrote a whole standard twice for two different institutions but that was not as effective as having a committee involved. In having co-chairs here, the assumption was the co-chairs would do the refining. There are also co-chairs for each of the substandards, and they had a primary responsibility to see that the documents were produced and the material was supplied to the writers.

Ralph said his standard really struggled with data. They started the subcommittee work in late August and the whole standard committee met together with the writers and lined out the deadlines. They kept pushing those dates out because they didn't have the necessary data – specifically survey data. After the site visit and we get the report, it might be helpful to establish the committee chairs so that we are not establishing them just to write the report but to oversee the process of staying in accreditation. Marc said he agrees with one exception. It is the role of this committee to track the planning agenda to ensure they are fulfilled.

Sandra said as we look into replacements for this committee we could look to those who have served on the standard committees so we have members who want to be actively involved.

Marc said we need to have a process in place for committee evaluation. If they want a more formal assessment of the process, he could develop a quick online survey and we can even make it systematic. Does the committee want that kind of assessment or are we ok with the dialogue and meeting minutes? Debbie Goodman responded that she thinks there should be a formal survey. Lisa said a survey might also help to better define the roles of the committee.

Ralph said if they are going to have a formal evaluation of the process, we might need to more formally organize the process. In this case, the evaluation will come first and it will let us know what we need to do to formalize the process. Under *Scope and Function*, the fourth guideline says "Recommend participants for self-study committees." Recommend to whom, to what body? Marc said he infers that to mean ourselves. Ralph said the way it happened in the past is that the Vice President selected these participants. We were asked to come up with names for co-chairs. A campus-wide email was also sent out asking for participants/volunteers.

Ralph said we want to ensure we have cross representation on standard committees, including community members. However, we currently don't have guidelines for establishing the committees. In his experience as a member of a visiting team, they were very interested in knowing what kind of

participation the college had in this process from the constituent groups of the college and from the community. Sandra said we are required to report that information in the document. Ralph said we are not required to set up the committee that way. Deb Parisot said her direction came from the liaisons. Ralph said it came from the liaisons understanding what was required, but it isn't anywhere in the documentation.

Sandra said we need to articulate our procedures better. That is part of this debriefing. To the best of our knowledge, this is how we need to set up and move forward. That is evaluation based on our bylaws and roles.

Marc said it would be better to pilot the survey with a select group of people. He would like to be able to use maybe four individuals as a test and we will need a timeline. Ralph said they can do a beta test anytime, but the final test has to wait until later. Marc said the actual evaluation could occur in late August. Sandra said that would be good. The following individuals were identified for the beta test: Marc, Ralph, Lisa, Debbie Parisot, Debbie Goodman, and Sandra.

Sandra said one of the critiques from the self-study is that we don't evaluate our process well. We need to start doing some activities that become familiar, and it is not enough to just have a meeting to discuss whether it went well. We need to have instruments in place to determine whether the process worked.

8. Timeline

Sandra went over the timeline. The document needs to be sent out by approximately August 24.

Marc said as of this time, very few people have seen the whole document. This committee and College Council will be very important in implementing the results. Lisa said she really looks forward to the whole process. When she first started on this committee, she thought it would be fairly simple and black and white, but it isn't. However, it should be.

Ralph said one of the key things that came out of this is we need to have our data collection ongoing. If we do that, it will smooth out a lot of the problems. The climate surveys should be done on an annual basis.

Sandra said when they were coming up with the planning agenda, it was clear we have to ask about useful information that is central to our mission to help us make more informed decisions. Ralph said how we prioritize the information is important and impacts student outcomes.

9. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn: Beam/Goodman. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:02 a.m.