



ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

May 3, 2017

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

Denise Axtell	Will Breitbach	Tim Johnston
Ron Marley	Becky McCall	Steve Mollman
Morris Rodrigue	Damaris Stevens	Ramon Tello
Courtney Vigna		

Members Absent

Raquel Good	John Whitmer
-------------	--------------

Guests

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

DISCUSSION/ACTION:

Damaris motioned to approve the minutes from the March 1st meeting. Becky seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

ACCJC Annual Report:

Will asked if anyone had any questions about program reviews. Ramon stated that College Council questioned the accuracy of program reviews. Will explained that we go with the standard definition of a program review, which is how many programs are on a cycle of assessment. Prior to this year's cycle we wouldn't have been 100%.

Quality Focus Essay:

Ramon said that the statement "the College learned a great deal from this experience" doesn't say much, we need to elaborate. He also noted that on the Project Activities portion of the report, the Assessment Committee should be included in the slot for the column labeled Responsible committee. Will said it could be a standing committee, ad hoc, or special task force. Ramon suggested it report to the Research Committee. Jenna said we should get the Research Office involved in the

conversation. Will listed the Research Office at this point. Morris said he feels it is very important to have faculty involvement. Research could take on some components of the work but the committee should guide the process. Morris reminded everyone that the whole point of the QFE is to dream the outcome. If we get wishy washy on the language, that doesn't present well. Will said we have notes for the second need, which we have identified as the data warehouse. Jenna said the focus is how we're moving forward. Toni Duquette is working on the data warehouse project. The hope is the warehouse will be the repository for clean data. They should also have tools that other individuals can use to pull reports. If we have easy access to data, we'll be able to see historical trends for purposes of planning.

Will said the Faculty Excellence Committee would like to do a workshop on accreditation at the Fall 2017 Flex Day. They would like some interactive meetings so we can be engaging. Morris said some good ideas of how to do this came up at the meeting and Will is going to follow up on the request.

Will said substandard I.B.3 and I.B.6 have been clarified by the ACCJC. These are federal standards and they are going to add goals to that line. I.B.6 deals with disaggregation of course level data. The assumption was to have disaggregation of data at the achievement level not the course level. The ACCJC is going to ask that program and institutional outcomes have data disaggregated.

Will said another thing he learned at the conference was how different schools structure the ASC. Some structure the ASC in a way that allows them to be more active in terms of a process that starts the writing of the document from the beginning of the accreditation cycle until the end. Denise asked for clarification on what that meant. Will explained that the standard chairs would be a part of the ASC and they would take the lead in writing the different sections. Will said we would want to constantly update the evidence. He also stated that whatever we do, it shouldn't be like the cycle we are currently finishing. The process for this cycle didn't allow us time to fill in any identified gaps, make action plans, and make necessary changes before the report was due. Morris said we could have key people from each standard that are writing as we go and can help fill in gaps. A lot of this comes down to education of the key people so they know what they are looking for. Will said we should make our case from the start and having more people will help. Ramon said he thinks it's a good idea but he is concerned about workload. Will suggested that we should look at revising the current committee commitment from a six year, down to maybe a two year commitment. Ultimately it may help

with participation and ability to improve the institution. Ron said he would be concerned with having the chairs on a two year cycle. Denise asked what we can do to entice faculty to join our committee. Morris said we have a lot of new faculty coming in and we can start engaging them early on. Ramon suggested we should have this discussion at the beginning of the year. Another suggested change was to establish co-chairs for each standard. In theory they would liaison with key committees. Morris said we repeated a lot of work from the year before. We can keep the standard chairs more involved from the start along with clear expectations. Morris said institutionally, we need standardized minutes that point to evidence. Will summarized we want to consider changes early next year. Morris added that fall is a good time to reflect on the process we want. Clear expectations and more direction will help direct the process next time. Will said this comes from wanting to put our full effort into meeting the standards. Morris said it isn't so much about the report but making sure we have all the processes in place. The visiting team will be looking for gaps. Will said the burden of the report writing will decrease. They just want to know that we have processes in place to make sure we meet the standards.