Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
April 12, 2011
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Levinson 40

Attendees: Joyce Ester, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Diana Kelly, Becky Mooney, Ann Morgan, Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Bernadette Towns, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Sean Hill (SGA General Council), Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman, Rene Trujillo

1. Review and approve March 29, 2011 minutes – Minutes approved with no changes

2. Report on action items from March 29, 2011 meeting

a). Nan will send Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names. This action item has not yet been completed.

b). Becky has sent all scheduled co-chair training dates to the SEC committee co-chairs.

c). The revised training script has been completed and sent to ASC committee and SEC co-chairs.

d). Rachel has spoken with Kimberly and Regina. They suggested a 90 minute workshop for training during flex week.

e). Ann has researched campus websites for additional information regarding program review communication.

f). Becky will ask Klint Rigby if he is interested in being added to the committee. This action item has not yet been completed.

3. Action items from April 12, 2011 meeting

Action: Becky will ask the SEC co-chairs meeting on April 29 the type of focus groups they are interested in.

Action: ASC committee - schedule a flex workshop on conducting focus groups.

Action: ASC committee – Send Kate feedback regarding changes to the Annual Program Review (APR) handout by 11:00 a.m. Wednesday, April 13

Action: Nan will send Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names.

Action: Becky will ask Klint Rigby if he is interested in being added to the committee.

3. Calendar – Kate Pluta

Kate sent a calendar to the committee regarding campus meetings (i.e. FCDC, College Council, etc.) for ASC to focus on timeline constraints.

4. Integrated Program Review (IPR) and Annual Program Review (APR) – Kate Pluta

Kate reported sending the Integrated Program Review (IPR) handout (Draft 7) to the curriculum committee for feedback. The IPR handed out in today's ASC meeting (Draft 8) is the latest copy to include these updates.

The Annual Program Review (APR) handout (Draft 8) emailed to ASC committee for discussion at today's meeting also includes the latest updates.

Annual Program Review (APR) - Handout

Who prepares it?
A suggestion was made to include online or Distance Education as one of the clusters.

What does the APR look like?
Include best practices regarding the evaluating process in order to receive feedback right away.

What must it reference?
Propose a question – What is the department doing for student success? Adding this question will help capture information regarding their retention rate and the areas that need improvement.

As a follow-up, a survey could be conducted campus wide to receive feedback regarding the results from 'the areas that need improving'.

A suggestion was made to include items from each department that don't cost money for improvement.

A suggestion was made to generalize the language/questions on the form to make it applicable for all departments on campus.

Who responds to it?
A suggestion was made to add the ISIT committee.

A question was asked if faculty requests for departments were going to be included on the document. If so, could the faculty request form be attached to the program review?

A suggestion was made to have representatives from each committee listed, so that different people will have a chance to be a part of it.

A suggestion of 1 committee read both Annual Program Reviews and Integrated Program Reviews to concentrate on recommendations.

A suggestion was made to schedule a flex workshop on how to fill out the forms for Annual Program Reviews and Integrated Program Reviews.

How do they respond to it?
A suggestion was made to match the questions we want to ask from each department with a summary response on the rubric.

The rubric should also include supporting and advancing student success information by prioritizing requests, include data back-up, and finally include improvements needed for each department.

Who gets the response?
Just the department should receive a copy of the rubric and synthesis.

The reporting process should include all the committees (Academic Senate, Admin Council, etc.), campus community (public folders), and a process for feedback needs to be included.

How is it reported to the college community?
It is reported through College Council representatives that inform the campus community via email.

How does it link to the budget?
The budget timeline for most districts is the academic year and should be completed by the beginning of May. It was suggested the budget distribution be in October for everyone to review until the end of January.

The Annual Program Review is currently due in October and recommendations are submitted by end of December for integration in the spring.

Who responds to it?
Decision makers

Integrated Program Review (IPR) – Handout
This item will be discussed at the next meeting.
Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 10th - 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40