Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
April 26, 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, Rene Trujillo, Rachel Vickrey

Absentees: Sue Granger-Dickson, Sean Hill (SGA General Council), Ann Morgan, Klint Rigby, Bonnie Suderman, Bernadette Towns

1. Review and approve April 12, 2011 minutes – Minutes approved with no changes

2. Report on action items from April 12, 2011 meeting

a). Nan sent Becky the 2009-10 Leadership Academy committee member names.

b). Becky met on April 29 regarding focus groups. Becky sent an email regarding the co-chair meeting announcements.

c). ASC committee – schedule a flex workshop on conducting focus groups.

d). ASC committee – Kate did receive feedback and has sent it back out to committee with revisions. She has also taken it to the Senate and College Council for review.

e). Becky has tried to contact Klint Rigby to ask him if he is interested in being added to the committee.

3. Action items from April 26, 2011 meeting

Action: Kate will bring a 3rd Quarterly Report (end of the year summary) to the next meeting on April 26.

Action: Add item on the agenda for the co-chairs meeting Friday April 29 – bring catalogs to the meeting to discuss General Education

Action: Nan to send the wording on the Integrated Program Review (IPR) process

3. Calendar

Kate proposed moving the ASC meeting to Monday afternoons (weekly) in the Fall 2011. Comments from committee: ISIT may conflict once a month with a Monday change; counseling meetings are held once a month during the same time frame; Nan has a meeting on the 2nd Monday that will conflict. Another proposal included alternating dates.

Kate proposed creating a calendar for next fall that includes campus meetings that occur each month. Many people are committed to various committees on campus and having a calendar would make it easier.

4. Integrated Program Review (IPR)

Draft 9 dated April 14, 2011 is reviewed by the committee to discuss the content.

A suggestion was made to add online (distance education) courses to the draft with the transfer general education cluster or as a stand-alone.

The Annual Program Review (APR) was taken to College Council and online distance education was suggested.

Who prepares it?

The Administrative Services cluster will have to work on it. For example, a topic for that year will have to be decided. The topic could be an issue or an institutional outcome. The report would include where they are currently and where they would like to be. The closing of the loop is the outcome of the research summarized in an objective report to be evaluated.

This structure of reporting will enable better communication on campus with the focus of one topic at a time. The communication dialog would take place between clusters (i.e. basic skills, CTE, library, etc). The outcome successively helps students in making career choices.

Discussion forums could be staged as a frame to get their conversations started.

The Annual Program Review (APR), the Integrated Program Review (IPR) will still need to be completed, but the IPR would come up every 'x' number of years. A cluster IPR would not be due every year. It was suggested we look at each cluster each year through the reporting process, so that items can be carried over into the next year, with the goal of being pro-active. The communication connection is made through people teaching particular courses, talking with others that teach the same courses.

Another suggestion was to have a college wide discussion regarding compressed classes (team teaching).

The clusters will have to determine ideas that will be used as a framework.

What does the IPR look like?
Mostly identification depending on the clusters – items that could be included are questions that answer what we are currently doing, what we are doing with assessment, and do we improve what we are doing.

This can be linked to the annual plan by taking what was learned from the IPR and including it in the APR. The link will address an overview of accountability.

Instructional areas can be a section itself that would fit into the annual program review – answers the number of students taking the course. In addition, the instructional areas could include a holistic perspective (clusters learning about departments and how they compliment each other toward student success) of the courses that lists degrees offered, certificates offered, etc.

The topic is to be decided by the clusters. A suggestion was made to review assessment as a foundation to review common areas. A facilitator will need to decide group priorities and issues that may connect with other clusters. The questions will be decided by members of the cluster.

Timeline: Fall brainstorming meeting to focus on items they will integrate into their annual report in the spring.