Participants in Attendance:

Roger Schultz, Rebecca Teague, Bill Vincent*, Charles Hawkins*, Becky Elam, Dennis Anderson, Irma Ramos, Richard Sisk, Marlene Cvetko, Ted Blake*, Marcus Castellanos, Fred Frontino, Janet McCurdy, Kristen Grimes
* MVC Room 201

I. Review Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting Minutes for March 17, 2010

No changes or comments.

II. Self-Study Evaluation Team Participant Insight

Becky Elam provided a handout highlighting information she learned while serving on three various site visit teams. It was noted that we need to have the pieces, including evidence, web access, etc., in place prior to the self-study being submitted so that the evidence is complete and fully accessible. This makes it a lot easier on the team to begin the evaluation process before arriving for the visit. So we should plan on having all the pieces in place by May 2011. It was also noted that it was extremely helpful to have a "war room" not only at the college campus, but also at the hotel location as well. The team will be working well into the night writing so the more accessible the evidence is, the better.

Roger also shared that in his past experiences, one of the most frustrating things as a team member was when evidence was presented midway through the process. As a team member you don't want any surprises, so it would be better to have evidence overkill than not have a critical piece available to the team.

III. Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Rebecca provided the rubric for evaluating institutions (sent as part of the agenda package) and noted that it is very important that we utilize this tool. We are still at the awareness and development stages but really should be at sustainable improvement. We have been doing a good job packaging, but need to move into proficiency. Committee chairs are encouraged to take this rubric back to their groups and be sure these processes are evaluated. Program Review and Planning should be at the sustained quality stage now, while SLO needs to be proficient now and at sustained quality by 2012.

IV. Reports and Updates from Standard Committees

a. Standard I – Had first meeting and identified staff to recruit. Have sectioned off the 8 different areas and questions specific to each. Suggested adding a column to the rubric for evaluating institutions for evidence.
b. Standard II – Have met and assigned people to various focus groups. Broke down the writing template so that individual focus groups can respond to a specific issue. They will be holding focus group meetings during college hours and on Fridays.
c. Standard III – Had first organizational meeting on 4/22, disseminated templates, and set sub-chairs for the sub-standards.
d. Standard IV – Holding their first meeting on 5/6 and will look at breaking it down into groups similar to Standard II. Need more participation from all groups.
e. Themes – Meeting next week with Rebecca to outline their role in the process. Since themes are new it is still unclear what role the themes group will play so this meeting will be helpful.

V. Recruitment Status Update

Richard Sisk provided names of several faculty members that have been recruited to the various committee groups. Ted has been able to recruit 4 students to participate so further discussion may need to take place to identify what areas to place them. It was noted that even though it is nice to have students throughout the entire process, we can recruit students that will be transferring prior to the site visit in 2011. Even though they may not be available for interview by the site team, it is important that we show broad participation throughout the process. We will need to continue to work with ASB, PTK, Honors and other faculty to recruit student participation and input. Several methods for disseminating information was shared including workshops/retreats, video messages, email, and brown bag lunches. We will need to continue to work on getting news out in manageable chunks.

Rebecca also noted that it was very important that Standards keep a thorough and accurate record of all participants throughout the process. Even if they only participate for a day, we need to include them in the roster of participants.

VI. Accreditation Climate Survey Questionnaire

As part of the agenda package a sampling of climate survey questions were distributed. The list is currently very long to provide a broad overview that should be narrowed down to about 10 per standard. Chairs should take back to their committees for discussion and decide which questions they feel are important to

ask. Surveys will be distributed in fall with approximately 40 questions max. This is basically a temperature gauge of where we are. It was suggested that under employment we add an "Other" category, that the survey be distributed twice - once in fall and again in spring, and that questions have an N/A option. An overarching theme of the survey is communication – how involved is staff/faculty in college processes and are we effective in getting information out to them. It was noted that it was important to provide the results back out in a timely manner and communicate that to them in the request to participate in the survey.

VII. Discuss Current Problems/Challenges

Recruitment of staff and faculty is foremost.

VIII. Next Steps

a. Timeline Review – Writing templates should be completed by August 1. A forum will be held during Convocation in August to provide input into the standards so having the data from the writing templates then will facilitate that process. The first draft of the document will begin in September. It was encouraged that committees attempt to have phone or CCCConfer participation with key faculty throughout the summer, as time is very short.
b. Next Meeting – May 25, 2010 – Room and Time TBD. Watch your email for the calendar appointment once a room and time have been identified.