

Accreditation Steering Committee
Meeting Summary
April 24, 2012
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Levinson 40

Attendees: Kate Pluta (co-chair), Sue Granger-Dickson, Bonnie Suderman, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Bill Cordero, Rachel Vickrey, Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Becky Mooney, Ann Morgan

Absentees: Bernadette Towns, Hamid Eydgahi

Guest: Stephen Eaton

1. Stephen Eaton and trends revealed in the new APR (3:30–4:00)
Rachel posted some questions to the listserv, based on the discussion at the last ASC meeting (see below).

APRs:

- Three main themes in APRs: budget (decreasing); supplies (costs increasing); underprepared students
- Very few APRs offered “opportunities” or goals to counter “threats” in the SWOT analysis
- Some chairs ignored many parts of the APR
- “Best Practices” were very weak
- Some goal setting and action plans were very doable
- SLOs addressed vaguely

Stephen’s suggestions for closing the loop:

- Offer better training to chairs and deans; invite department personnel; vary training times, adapt SEC co-chairs model
- Offer examples of best practices (e.g., ISIT and M&O connected weakness with opportunities for improvement; math needs smaller classes, improved labs, more tutors
- Assign PRC committee members as liaisons to provide more directed help
- Put funding behind College Goals
- In APRs speak to Strategic Goals or APPs - how we are going to achieve these goals (from ngh)

Stephen’s co-chair tasks:

- Already sent general letter with summary response to FCDC
- Send Final PRC response to department chairs by April 27
- Copy PRC files to thumb drive for Marilyn Davidson and OAA
- Send summary response to Academic Senate and College President
- Identify best APRs and why

2. Review and approve minutes—Rachel

- Minutes of April 17, 2012 reviewed and approved as recorded

3. SEC update—Becky and Bonnie
 - Becky will send update to SEC co-chairs
4. Strategic Planning and the role of ASC—Ann
 - Not discussed
5. ACCJC update—Nan
 - Not discussed
6. Integrated Program Review—How do we get it started?
At the December meeting we agree that the IPR should roll out 2013-14.
 - Not discussed
7. Additional items?
Changes in Self Evaluation review timeline
 - Chancellor, Vice Chancellor Ed. Services, & BOT sub-committee now have document
 - Will return with comments to BC May 7
 - Nan discussed May 23 date with BOT sub-committee reviewing the document
 - With all reviewing draft at same time Nan presented cogent argument about not expecting major changes
8. Adjourn - Last Meeting: Tuesday, May 8, 2012 3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Levinson 40

Comprehensive Visit: Monday, October 22—Thursday, October 25, 2012

Rachel's notes from April 24 Agenda:

The main thing I would like to hear from Stephen is more details about the themes from the APRs turned in. I would like him to flesh out the memo that he sent to chairs.

Some ideas: Though the state budget is a “threat” to all as he stated, not all departments are affected equally. Specific examples of recurring concerns would be helpful.

Increased cost of supplies and services will again vary from department to department. Are there specific supply costs that are affected specific areas? Are some programs threatened because the cost of supplies is becoming prohibitive?

Also the issue of underprepared students varies across campus as well. Did the APR data reveal any specific themes? Different concerns for departments that offer only transfer level courses? Best practices to share?

Finally, my experience is that in reading a set of these annual reviews, some ideas/brainstorms occur as to campus-wide solutions, combining concerns of one or two departments or areas. In the course of the discussion, did the APR committee have any ideas for changes across disciplines or departments that would benefit the college? Any specific observations would be helpful.