

Accreditation Committee

MINUTES

OCTOBER 4, 2006

1:30 – 2:30 P.M.

NH 120

MEETING CALLED BY	Troy Sheffield, Dean, Research, Planning & Development
FACILITATOR	Troy Sheffield, Dean, Research, Planning & Development
NOTE TAKER	Dena Peters, Secretary III, Research, Planning & Development
TIMEKEEPER	Meeting began at approximately 1:30 p.m.
ATTENDEES	Troy Sheffield; Dena Peters; Cindy Parish; Patti Wall; Kay Weiss; Diane Dusick; Lori Blecka; Margaret Dodds-Schumacher; Jack Jackson; Marilyn Johnson; Kathy Kafela; Haragewen Kinde; Ann Klein; Laura Leedahl; Susan Bangasser

Agenda topics

OLD BUSINESS

TROY SHEFFIELD

DISCUSSION	<p>Selection of Co-Chairs – Troy asked if there were any nominations for co-chairs for the Accreditation Committee; Kay Weiss nominated Troy and Jack Jackson seconded. Troy suggested that we should have a co-chair and that Horace Alexander had voiced an interest in helping to write the Self-Study. It was moved (Kay Weiss) and seconded (?) that Horace Alexander serve as the co-chair for the Accreditation committee.</p> <p>Conferences – Troy asked if anyone planned to attend the conference in San Diego, mentioned at the last meeting, "Strengthening Student Success." Kay mentioned that registration was now closed. Troy reminded the committee about the conference in January 2007, "Collegial Consultation & the Successful Self Study," in San Francisco. Anyone interested, please submit the travel/conference paperwork for this event.</p> <p>Standard Co-Chairs (Handout) – Troy reviewed the handout on the Four Accreditation Standards which listed the various co-chairs from Valley. Volunteers are needed for the Leadership and Governance Standard.</p>
-------------------	--

NEW BUSINESS

TROY SHEFFIELD

DISCUSSION	<p>Discussion of Self-Study (Handout) – Troy referenced the handout on the self-study presentation and asked for comments from those who attended the Self Study on 9/22/06. Kathy Kafela said the self-study provided a good orientation and background information, and helped her have a better understanding of the standards, and highlighted the mission exercise. Diane Dusick mentioned a "lightbulb" question asked at the self-study session, "what should your report look like?" and how it is basically organized. It appears, according to Diane that we have to organize by the standards and the themes—essentially writing two reports. Troy also noted that the trainers said we could write the Self-Study based on the standards, however, use the themes in the summary of each standard</p> <p>Assessment Matrix (Kay Weiss) –Kay Weiss reviewed an assessment matrix along with the completion of all SLO's. (Some SLO's have not been submitted to the instruction office, but we are nearing 100%). The matrix was broken up in various colors, or sections, of the assessment process: Blue (where we are right now), discussion on exceptional and master-level skills and</p>
-------------------	---

what is “good enough”; Green (review) gaps and identify; Orange (what we are doing to improve student learning?) creating dialogue; Yellow (reevaluate). Margaret Dodds-Schumacher suggested a change in wording “pedagogy” to “andragogy”; Troy posed a question to the Self-Study trainers on, “how many outcomes do we need to assess?”;. She received the distinct impression from them that each course needed to assess more than one outcome. Discussion ensued on FT faculty vs. adjunct faculty. What happens if a course is only taught by part-time faculty. Kay said this is a serious issue that needs to be dealt with soon.

Website: (similar to handout in IIA, however, it is based on “evaluating institutions” and evidence; will include discussion boards) – Troy referenced a link to a survey from San Diego City College for committee members to review (beginning on p. 71) for possible use as our Self-Study questionnaire. Currently we are distributing a campus climate survey. However, we will need a follow-up with a satisfaction survey. It would be helpful if we adopted a survey like the one suggested from San Diego City College. Hopefully, we can do use this same survey several times over the next few years to gather baseline data and then support it with more longitudinal data. A follow-up email will be sent to the committee with the link and pages to be reviewed for our next meeting.

Next Meeting/Service Day/Discussion – Troy suggested that the next meeting would be half hour to one hour segments on November 7 from 1:30-2:30, 2:30-3:30, 3:30-4:30. The purpose is to meet and discuss the survey in smaller groups. In addition, she posed the question of members of the college community selecting or self-assigning themselves to one of the standards. There appeared to be some merit to understanding at least one standard thoroughly. If most faculty wanted to sign up for Standard IIA (Instruction), perhaps we could limit the number of people for each standard and spread the participation of faculty to all standards. Troy asked if there had been discussion on mission statement and making any changes to better reflect what is required in the Standards. Susan Bangasser mentioned that this was discussed at College Council. Troy stressed that committees and others should be reviewing the mission in light of the standards—especially how the mission emphasizes student learning. Question on who will be surveyed (everyone).

The December 8th service day was discussed. Susan Bangasser thinks that Accreditation should be at least one of the topics. More to follow on what will be included in the service day.

CONCLUSIONS

The next meeting(s) will be Tuesday, November 7, 2006, from 1:30 – 4:30 p.m. Will meet in small groups in one hour increments. The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.