

Accreditation Steering Committee
Draft Minutes
November 20, 2012
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40
Agenda

Updates & Status Reports

1. Annual Program Review cycle & update on process—email sent November 15, 2012
Kate forwarded the APR report to the committee, as well as a summary of the key points of the summary. This will be discussed later under the topic of Integrated Program Review.
2. Report on outstanding Action Items from November 6:

Action Item 1: (From October 9 meeting) Nan: Curriculum review process and CurricUNET status. *Update:* Nan was not present

Action Item 2: Todd: Pilot update (Content Management System). *Update:* There is a working version of the Content Management System and it looks good. But it is not quite ready to pilot. Information Services is still working with authentication issues associated with who will have access to the documents. We want all employees to have access, but not the general public, so there needs to be some sort of password protection, and that requires use of existing employee password accounts or development of new accounts. Todd has suggested that we get to the system through the portal so there is no need for a separate password account. This item will be removed from the list of Action Items until the system is ready to pilot.

Action Item 3: Kate will put College Committee Fall Report Summary on the agenda for the next meeting. *Update:* See agenda item 6 below. Jennifer Marden has indicated that not all committees have submitted their reports yet, so the Summary is not available.

Action Item 5: Make sure *Committee Co-Chairs* Listserv is accurate. Todd will make a request to Debbie on behalf of the ASC to make sure the list is up to date and accurate. *Update:* Debbie Spohn believes the Committee Co-Chair listserve is accurate. Bonnie indicated that she was one of the missing co-chairs, but she sent an email to have her name added immediately, so the list may have been correct by the time Todd talked with Debbie. Kate will send an email letting Jennifer Marden, Academic Senate Secretary, know that any future changes in faculty chairs must go to Debbie.

Action Item 6: Kate will email the parties responsible Administrator/Champion outlined in the strategic plan asking them for a progress update and to determine a time frame that will ensure their tasks are completed. *Update:* Kate developed and revised draft based on feedback; awaiting approval from Nan. Email with draft sent October 10; draft of email attached. Kate is still waiting for approval from Nan. Kate will send an email to Nan asking for update on process to insure tasks are completed. Kate and Nan did discuss the suggestion that deans give progress reports twice per year. Content Management System could be used for this. Kirk suggested the progress reports come at the same time as the committee progress reports.

Action Item 7: This was an addition to the November 6 agenda. Bonnie met with HR before the accreditation visit and discussed the creation of a survey that was supposed to go out to faculty who have served on a hiring committee in the past two years. Kate is unsure if this survey went out and Bonnie will update us on this issue at our next meeting. *Update:* Bonnie met with Abe Ali, Mary Jo Pasek and Lisa Fitzgerald to talk about this item. Abe Ali has concerns about the validity of the results of the survey. They will run another survey that Lisa will help develop to verify the results. The initial survey will be given to everyone who has been on a screening committee for the last couple of years, and then the questionnaire will be given to all future screening committee members. Abe wants to embed the general evaluation of HR into the Class Climate survey for the district. The next such survey won't be for about 3 years, so we still need one now to meet accreditation recommendations. Bonnie is still working on this.

Topics for Discussion, Planning, and Implementation

1. DRAFT of Accreditation process evaluation—*draft attached to November 6 agenda*
The committee discussed the merits of a survey or surveys and a focus group or groups. **Action Item 1:** The committee members are to send Kate ideas, sample questions and/or people that should be included in the evaluation process. *Update:* Only Bonnie responded. Her concern was things we need to remember to do next time. E.g., the Institutional Researcher should not have their own accreditation standard, but should float to help everyone else. If ASC committee members think of something else to add to survey, send suggestions to Kate. Kate will ask Jennifer Jett, Rebecca Mooney and the other co-chairs for ideas, as well. Bonnie suggested that next time we ask the district for their expectations at the beginning of the accreditation process, rather than receive this information after the fact. **New Action Item 1:** Kate will contact Lisa Fitzgerald about developing a survey.
2. Integrated Program Review—*revised proposal—sent via email October 30*
Action Item 2: Committee members were asked to send Sue and copy the entire committee with ideas and outcomes for IPR. Sue will collate the materials and send out draft 12 for the next meeting. *Update:* We will meet with PRC on February 5. Sue emailed us the draft IPR report, which included APR. Kate sent us a summary of common themes. The discipline groups can discuss the common themes. This would help depts. to understand the needs of other depts. and how the various depts. fit together. One idea is that each dept could read the APR of another dept for better understanding of the dept. The APR should be read before the discipline groups get together.
We could look at the Strategic Plan objectives to see which groups align for IPR purposes. Kate meets with the committee co-chairs in December. She is trying to develop a visual master plan that would keep different groups together if they are working on the same strategic plan objective.
APR needs to better integrate outcomes for budget and curriculum. Sue commented that her draft is a way to capture information and assess it to see if things are working. IPR could be done every year for some groups and less often for other discipline groups. Bonnie is concerned about how we will bring together the people who would actually write the report.
Kate indicated that PRC has done a summary table of APR, and now needs to close the loop with what they've learned. IPR may not roll out next year—need APR solid before rolling our IPR. **New Action Item 2a:** Kate and Sue will work to tweak IPR Draft #10.
3. Establish procedure for fulfilling responsibility outlined in Strategic Plan:
"Recommendation 3: Progress on the objectives should be monitored by the Accreditation Steering Committee which should provide an annual report to College

Council" (2). See Action Item 6 above (awaiting approval from Nan) **Action Item 3:**
Nan will send update. *Update:* Nan was not present.

4. Establish procedure for ensuring progress on Actionable Improvement Plans—Nan
Note: Please bring AIPs from Self Study (pink printed copy from first meeting)
Nan was not present.
5. Review and discuss Committee Co-Chairs reports on aligning committee goals with college goals. *Note: Jennifer Marden will be sending an updated copy to ASC.*
Nan was not present.
6. Preparing for Response to ACCJC recommendations (received late January or February 2013) *We need to be prepared to respond to ACCJC recommendations. Sometimes the response is required within 6 weeks.*

Additional items?

Further discussion included the need for disciplines to evaluate degrees and certificates, #students going through their program(s), etc., to be sure we are effective and efficient.

PRC and Curriculum, Assessment and ASC Co-Chairs will meet in December to talk about how everything fits together.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 22, 2013, 3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40