**Accreditation & Institutional Quality Committee (AIQ)**

**Tuesday, May 5, 2015**

**3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40**

***Draft Minutes***

***Present: Co-chair Kate Pluta, Co-chair Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Kirk Russell, Kim Nickell, Shannon Musser, Bill La, Janet Fulks, Todd Coston, Kim Nickell***

***Absent: David Neville, Zav Dadabhoy, Anthony Culpepper, Michael Self, Jennifer Jett***

***Notetaker: Shannon Musser***

1. **Approved Minutes – April 21 (Rachel Vickrey)**
2. **Updates**
   1. **Accreditation Survey:** Accreditation survey results were presented to Academic Senate and College Council. Gayle presented data to College Council. Survey results were separated into key areas of no concern (>55% strongly agree and agree) and concern (>35% strongly disagree and disagree). The final results of the survey must be shared with the community – but then what do we do with that information? We should do a follow up in the fall. It’s one thing to get the information, it’s another to have a dialogue about what that means.  
        
      There are some issues with differentiating BC vs District services – for example with HR, technology, facilities. There are some things that are physically located on campus, but report to the District, and there are complex relationships and differences. There was discussion on how to establish those differences on the survey, perhaps by using examples and asking more specific questions – but then the survey could get too big. This could potentially be added to areas’ program review in the future (not for this fall). Some of this is covered in the Technology Survey.

Perhaps have a smaller survey every month, focusing on different areas.

* 1. **Midterm Report:** Draft 1 is complete, and we are now focusing on responses to recommendations. There was discussion on Substantive Change and issues with accreditation for the Baccalaureate, and where the accreditation for the baccalaureate will come from.   
       
     Pilot colleges for the baccalaureate attended a workshop for baccalaureate and accreditation. Upper division gen ed courses has been an issue for many. Financial Aid also has some differences.
  2. **District Response to District Recommendations 1-4:** Final copy was received on May 5. There was a meeting last week. Colleges can make stylistic changes to the document, but not content changes.  
       
     District’s section is done, with evidence sent.
  3. **Strategic Directions:** AIQ was invited to the meeting on May 1.   
       
     Strategic Direction #4 (Oversight and Accountability) has some initiatives that are AIQ responsibilities – 9, 15, 16, 17.  
       
     The Strategic Directions team shared the initiatives in May because they likely would affect work plans.  
       
     Should committees/individuals now be able to “vet out” what shouldn’t be there? In evaluation, add an explanation with the red x – this is no longer an issue, no time/resources, planned for next year.

1. **Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI):** Berkeley City College sought help and insight. Other colleges have also invited teams. Kate Pluta was part of the team that visited Berkeley City College. This initiative isn’t saying that a college has problems, but is more to get a fresh pair of eyes.
2. **2015-16 Refreshments sign-up sheet:** Members signed up for refreshments for 2015-16 meetings.

1. **Faculty terms:** We will need to edit the charge in the fall to add an equity position (Odella’s position was as faculty, and the charge was written before the equity position existed). There should be some other edits based on college structure.  
     
   Tarina (Academic Senate Secretary) asked about AIQ faculty term lengths. We need to establish term lengths, and who is who:  
     
   Basic Skills (was Odella): 2 years  
   Gen Ed (Rachel): 3 years  
   Student Affairs (Bill La): 3  
   Library (Kirk): 3  
   CTE (vacant): 2  
   At Large - 2   
     
   BAS – should someone be added? They will have a quick turnaround on data, but they might not have time for the AIQ committee.  
     
   Should we look at/create a co-chair job description? Should there be one for each committee?
2. **Integrating college planning and evaluation:** Kate drafted an email to co-chairs about Program Review timeline, and what each committee/group does with Program Review information. This is to create an integrated college planning calendar. Currently, Budget and Program Review processes are not really linked.
3. **Plans for Fall:** Edit charge, surveys and sharing results, tackle initiatives from strategic directions document