Minutes for Oct. 19, 2011 Self Study Standard I Team Meeting

Kara will email the consolidated document to the committee.

Administration will be holding “office hours” for informal interviews. Dates are times are noted on the October 14, 2011 Agenda from Marcia (attached).

Marcia also mentioned several formatting standardizations for the second drafts of the documents at the Steering Committee Meeting. Five bullet points are listed in the agenda.

Also, the URLs of the evidence should both in text and in the back on a reference page made for the purpose of keeping the links in one place.

The following are specific feedback points from Marcia and Erika with regards to the sections:

Sections I.A.1, I.A.2

It is important to note the CTE linkages with UHWO and other examples of how we work collaboratively. We can get more history on those from Erika.

Document governance and decision making processes.
The Chancellor's message on GenEd policy sent to the FSEC speaks to Administration's consultation with faculty and staff.

We need to be looking at the process v. the product and the writing in the section represents this.

Correct the 80% retention rate to something that should be closer to about 40% as that would be more accurate.

Once the campus is good with the Mission Statement, it goes to John Morton. It will then go to the BOR by the end of the calendar year.

In the System, we seem to be on track with where we are in the process of Self Study.

Sections I.A.3, I.A.4

With the governance and decision-making process, the Planning Committee was tasked with overseeing the mission statement process. The Chancellor’s process of policy-making and sending statements to the FSEC (see Jerry’s recent email message on GenEd about this) can be documented.
The curriculum handbook and flowchart have been updated so we need to reference those. We can also interview Russell regarding Curriculum Central.

With regards to GenEd for CTE Initiatives, self-evaluation must be fully compliant here. For sections in which standards are met but for which work can still be done, we can put these in the Self-Evaluation section, rather than in the Planning Agenda. Take out the "partially met" language since we should be fully compliant by the time we finalize the document.

**Sections I.B.1, I.B.2**

Once the mission statement is approved, it needs to be the face of the campus. In the section for I.A.2, we need to document that. Marcia is putting together the self study newsletter and Billie is working on the public self study pamphlets. The civil service folks also need to be brought in on this effort.

Would lecturers and part timers have a chance to give input?

Shift language to “institutional outcomes,” in line with “program level outcomes. Once the Institutional Outcomes are approved, find out what they are and then add them to this section.

References to things prior to the last self-study should not be there.

**Sections I.B.3, I.B.4**

Of concern to us is also the loss of STEM funding (close to a $100,000 loss). We didn’t meet the STEM requirements so John Morton’s office had financial resources held back. Most of our programs are actually in STEM, so this is especially crucial money to not be getting. We need to document this.

Discuss performance-based funding.

Document the work on the Strategic Plan more heavily. For example, use graduation rates, and retention rates. Email Erika for the relevant graduation, transfer, and enrollment rates.

Also look at Achieving the Dream data.

Can also link to John Morton’s office’s other data.

MAP data is general, but also useful for giving the connections, etc., in the broader picture.
The process of program review is linked to budgeting processes... The program review is done. Based on the review budget requirement, changes are implemented if needed. These changes are reassessed and then there is a loop-back to program review.

The Program Review leads to the reallocation of resources. Institutional effectiveness leads to the Strategic Plan and Report Card of how you need to be doing and where you need to be by 2015.

The Program Review Report Card is due to Systems in December.

IRO has created a dynamic site: hawaii.edu/iro. See the CFO menu.

**Sections I.B.5, I.B.6**

Go through the whole IRO capacity and communicate this back to the departments. SECE is available online. Email Erika for what Steve Shigemoto has done—summary of the SECE Cover Letter (Executive Summary)

For Satisfaction Surveys, Ross is probably the best person to talk to.

Use of accjc.org for resources like the manual that Erika provided for us can also be used.

With regards to evaluation, we can show that we are doing it but not as broadly based as we had expected. Indicate ways of how we have thought about remedying this. We can find ways to address whatever is lacking, as long as we have evidence to show that we have identified the issues and have addressed it. An example would be broad-based engagement of the community with evidence that we’ve tried.

We have now done at least one or two cycles (cycles of review) at this point. We can send out surveys to the governing bodies asking what has worked. It would also be good to have some positive feedback.

In mid-October, we can meet with Erika to have her explain the “circle of life” to our group.

How the Planning Council has been assessed has been an issue, but work has been done on assessing the budgeting process and Planning Council. For example, Ralph and Kara developed a way to measure how the Planning Council is doing.

**Sections I.B.7**
There is some overlap with Standard II.A., B., and C. with regards to improvement in certain areas. Contact Standard II Chairs.

Include Budgeting process in section
Evidence to show that we are doing what we say were doing

Standard I should be represented at John Morton’s presentations.

Wednesday at 2pm is a good time for the committee.
We can try scheduling a meeting for our standard with Erika and Marcia

Minutes respectfully submitted by Fumiko Takasugi