Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
March 8, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, Sue Granger-Dickson, Sean Hill (SGA General Council), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney (co-chair), Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Rene Trujillo, Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman, and Bernadette Towns

1. Review and approve March 1, 2011 minutes

- The minutes dated March 1, 2011 were reviewed and approved with no changes.

2. Report on action items from March 1, 2011 meeting

a). Becky met with Nan to review the SEC list of department names. Some additions were made to the list. There are still 3 committees without co-chairs. Becky passed out the most current list of participants.

b). Nan sent out an email to the deans to involve them in the recruitment of the 3 committees without co-chairs. This action item is deferred until next meeting to get a complete update from Nan.

c). The dates for co-chair training are: Tuesday, March 15 3:30-5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40; Wednesday, March 16 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Collins Conference Center; Friday, March 25 10:30 a.m.-12noon in Levinson 40; and an additional date is added on Friday, March 18 1:00-2:30 p.m. tentatively in Levinson 40. All meeting locations are to be confirmed.

d). Kate will send out training script and put timeline together to send to the committee. This action item has not yet been completed.

e). Nan will contact Greg for recruiting volunteers from the District level. LaMont said he briefly discussed this with Greg. This action item has not yet been completed.

Action Items of March 8, 2011:

Action: Nan is to give the committee an update regarding the email sent to the deans for recruiting the 3 committees without co-chairs.

Action: Becky will contact Steve Hageman to recruit him for IIA. Instructional Programs.

Action: Becky will contact Bernadette Towns to get a list of the Assessment Committee members.

Action: Nan will send a list to Becky of the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee members.

Action: Becky will send out all scheduled co-chair training dates to the SEC committee co-chairs.

Action: Kate will send out a training script and put timeline together to send to the committee.

Action: Nan will contact Greg regarding recruiting volunteers from the District level.

Action: Vickie to send the form provided to FCDC for Unit plan review and recommendations.

Action: Diana Kelly will forward a copy of the comments of Program Review to the ASC committee.

Action: Kate to get a copy of the Curriculum Review form from Janet Fulks.

Action: Vickie will send the form regarding faculty position requests to ASC.

Action: Kate will talk to Nan about scheduling another ASC meeting on March 22 or March 29.

Action: Kate will send out an email to committee regarding training.

Action: Kate will ask Greg to recruit the additional 3 faculty co-chairs.

Action: Sue will modify the strategic planning handout based on discussion today. Diana, Ann, Kirk, and Kate will work with her.

3. Calendar – update

Becky contacted Amber Chiang to work with her in developing a campus calendar to post on the BC website.

4. First issue referred to ASC

Diana Kelly and Ann Morgan had previously forward copies to the committee of the unit plan and program review forms as a focus of this discussion.

Unit Plans

Ann referred to the unit plan documents and said this was the 4th revision of the documents. A 'Unit Plan Task Force' was assembled to get feedback as to what should be included in the documents. The current version is the outcome of the feedback. This version of the document now asks for a resource request. It asks to summarize a units mission with a brief description. The main difference from the older version is it asks for a summary of previous years, asking to state whether needs were met, to giving a description of how their assessment results in planning and budget. The first year in 2010, is the first year, that assessing unit planning and budget were linked. The unit plan documents also ask the units to provide relevant program data; some of this data is available through the Institutional Research and Development department for service departments on campus, and others keep track of their own data. The document provides 'where to go' links for further information regarding the data that should be provided in the documents. The document asks to provide other information such as, a summary of how their planning pertains to college goals, strategic goals, and institution outcomes. It also has an area to list equipment and staffing needs, including the priority of the request, and a summary of the expected outcome if these needs are met for their unit.

Sue asked Ann about training departments in understanding and filling out the documents correctly. Ann said that departments are asked to contact her to schedule a meeting, and/or workshop, to provide such training.

Rachel asked what happens to the unit plans after they are prepared. Ann said they are reviewed with department chairs and deans and then submitted to Nan's office and FCDC for feedback and recommendations. LaMont stated the plans will be reviewed earlier this year, beginning in the fall, because of the budget request component for (2012-2013 year), which will be submitted to the budget committee. In past years, it went directly to the President. Ann keeps copies of all unit plans for the educational master plan and posts them to the web for public view.

Becky asked if campus decisions are made from the unit plan. Ann said the President uses these documents to make decisions from.

Program Review

Program review is on a 6 year cycle and typically due the year after curriculum review for the instructional programs. There are a number of problems with the IEC Program review documents in terms of asking the right questions on the form to receive complete information without duplicating answers.

Question B.3.c. Comparison with other programs – there are a number of programs from other colleges that include student learning - direct outcomes, and collaboration regarding curriculum. This includes other comparisons from other colleges on the form that may help answer this question.

Question C. Summary analysis of enrollment, indirect outcomes, and productivity trends – How to interpret data they receive may be a result of not answering this question correctly.

Question D. Required resources (budget area D.1. and D.2.) – these questions should be revised to clarify the information we are asking, so that it is better understood. The asterisk in D.2. explains why additional resources are needed in one or two paragraphs. If this question is not answered, IEC will find it hard to support the need for this area.

Question E.7. List the required resource needs in priority order – could be combined with question D.2. because it factors in needs and trends for the future.

Question E.8. Develop plan of action and timeline – this is usually answered in a one or two year plan. The importance of the plan needs to emphasized.

IEC isn't pleased with the in formation on the (3b and 3c) of the purpose and goals of program, because it sometimes doesn't get answered at all. In area C. brief data will be provided; budget area D. doesn't make sense to the committee, which in turn doesn't make sense to those answering the questions. Diana stated she has tried to get a sub committee to address these issues for help with modifications. Many changes can be done and feedback is encouraged.

Areas with duplications:

1. Question B3.f Curricular barriers – IEC receives duplicate information from Question E.2, E.3, and E.6.
2. Question E.2. Factors and trends and Question E.3. Describe general plans are both similar to Question A.3.b. regarding strengths of the program and Question D.2. that asks about additional resources (budget).

3. Question E.6.b. innovative use of technology is similar to Question B.3.g. describe use of innovate technology.

5. Data on program review

Kate discussed the handout of program review to include: course outlines/syllabi showing intended learning outcomes and assessment methods; catalogues showing program goals and learning outcomes; budget showing adequate resources; policies on curricular review; and evidence of regular course review and improvement.

6. Notes of meeting with Nan

Kate met with Nan to discuss the following:

1. The annual review should be more inclusive in terms of information that is provided. CTE and Allied Health programs use their own reviews for outside accreditation. Both these programs can use a summary sheet of their own review, rather than duplicating the information on a different form.
2. Program review is part of the educational master plan. The program review summary should have more in depth analysis data. The document doesn't need to be longer.
3. The committee needs to provide strategies for department chairs
4. The committee needs to review all disciplines that teach basic skills (Gen Ed/transfer and CTE programs) to see how they relate to each other. For example, student support services and operational services would meet to discuss planning and program reviews to link these areas. The idea is to formally require working together on campus to improve student outcomes. The committee will have to come up with ideas to accomplish this.
5. The idea is to integrate annual review, curriculum review, and program review into one. From there, a decision needs to be made on how these will be presented.

Rachel suggested that program reviews could be done every 3 years, with alternate due dates, such as before curriculum review. This would allow integration to take place by incorporating program review and unit plans together. If, a group is completing a program review, they wouldn't have to complete a unit plan for the year.

Kurt asked if we as a college are allowed to establish our own timelines. Kate confirmed we are able to do so.

Hamid suggested gathering information that shows a trend of a 5 year plan that show a true analysis of data on campus.

Ann indicated that Chaffey College is a college that used an earlier version of the CurriCUNET module and has changed program reviews to 3 year cycles.

A brief summary: After program review is reviewed by the IEC committee, the committee brings the program reviews to College Council to receive recommendations, commendations, and budget allocations.

Kurt asked who accepts the program review documents. Ann confirmed that she keeps them in her office.

7. Strategic Planning

Sue discussed the strategic planning handout. Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) will have to change the program review name. Sue discussed the changes that occur with environmental scan, jobs, and occupational readiness, to name a few, by looking at a 3 year plan. A 3 year plan would capture some of the changes made through the years. The program review committee works with all groups to identify common themes, resources, and priorities. A list of strategies and training for department chairs could be organized. The data for student success with suggestions needs to be the focus of program review. Who does program review report to? The combination of program review/budget meetings would have input from faculty, staff, and administrators to one area.

Rachel suggested that curriculum review be added to the handout.

8. ASC Schedule

Kate said the next meeting is scheduled for April 12, but would like to schedule another meeting on March 22 or 29th.

9. Philosophy statement

The committee received a positive response from College Council regarding the philosophy statement. College Council committee will ask Academic Senate to vote (must have consensus) to move forward, as is, at their next meeting.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 2011
                       3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Collins Conference Center