



ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

September 7, 2016

Board Room, 4:00-5:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Members Present

Will Breitbach	Raquel Good	Tim Johnston
Ron Marley	Becky McCall	Steve Mollman
Damaris Stevens	Ramon Tello	Courtney Vigna
John Whitmer		

Members Absent

Denise Axtell	Peggy Moore
---------------	-------------

Guests

Jenna Highfield	Kate Mahar
-----------------	------------

DISCUSSION/ACTION:

Ramon motioned to approve the minutes from the August 24th meeting. Ron Marley seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

COMMITTEE FEEDBACK MECHANISM ON DRAFT:

Will sent out an email to the individuals working on the initial draft of the self-evaluation. He outlined the aggressive timeline we have set for everyone to submit their drafts. Once the drafts are finished, Will suggests we put them online. We can then divide up the four Standards among the committee and give our feedback. He was thinking we could compile the feedback online through a survey organized by standard. Hopefully this would help people writing the draft have a clear picture of what changes to make. Jenna commented that she was trying to visualize how to populate the survey. Will clarified the comments would be the survey, not the actual document. Kate asked if the readers will be operating from a rubric in the survey. Will said we will make a claim at the end of the document about whether or not we have met the standard for the general comments do we want to have initial feedback givers give additional feedback. Becky said it would be helpful. Ron said it would need to be generalized because each standard is so different. Will

said that he would like people to suggest additional evidence if they have some. We need to be clear that we are looking for honest/constructive feedback. The feedback is open to discovery by the team. Will asked if we can work with Jenna to develop this tool. How do we want to divide up this work? Ramon asked about a spreadsheet versus a Google doc. Will said he wants open ended comments from everyone. Ramon asked whether we can open different pages or different surveys depending on how we divide the work. Ramon asked where we will keep this document. Jenna suggested a shared folder where it is easy to get back to the writers. Our turnaround time is 12 days. All the drafts are due to us by November 2nd. The document will stay in different areas. There will be limitations to the initial draft, such as evidence not being accessible at the time the steering committee is reviewing the draft. John asked whether there is a target length. Will said that the document should be as long as it needs to be, no longer. Will said we need to make sure the standards are addressed directly without additional information. John asked whether we have an expectation of what this document will look like. Will said it will roughly be 200 pages, with standards two and three being the largest. Will and Jenna will work on our feedback form. We will focus on the Quality Focus Essay after the 2nd draft when we can see which areas need improvement. Ramon asked about using Canvas. Will said he will look at this as a tool. Jenna suggested Survey Monkey. Ramon said Canvas would show a broad effort to get feedback. Will asked who would give feedback on each section. Becky suggested two people per standard and we can sign up for the standards.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK MECHANISM ON DRAFT:

Will suggested that we use a similar tool to get campus feedback. Ramon asked if there will be another step before we give the draft to the editors. There is a timing issue. Will said the second draft will be something we can share widely. Ron said if we put out the whole thing, people aren't going to want to read it. Standard two is going to be the biggest standard but should have the biggest group of people with interest in it. Will said we will allow for electronic feedback as well as open forums. Ron said it is useful but we need to make sure there is active feedback as well. Will said we should divvy it up and put it on a webpage. John suggested offering flex credit for faculty to review it. We have to maintain an aggressive timeline because there has to be two readings by Senate in April. Will explained we need the time in early spring to get the document refined. Kate said she is co-chair with a faculty member as editor of the draft. Ramon wants to know when the second draft will be due to the editor. Ramon asked if the editor will give a first draft in early February. The editor will have something to work with after break. John asked if we are asking people to do too much. He said that we need to

make sure the visiting team is aware that we have made efforts to make accreditation a priority. Ron said he doesn't feel like the visiting team will hold the tight timeline against us. Will clarified that there is a plan for wider feedback. We will also have open meetings. The document will go through all of the councils, Academic Senate, and Student Senate. The document will also be all online for people to review. Ron asked about Advisory Committee's and whether or not they should be asked for feedback. Will said he would look into that issue.