Accreditation Task Force Minutes

3/18/2016

Present: Diane Caulfield, Ross Egloria, Cynthia Smith, Shanon Miho, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Patrick Patterson, Jeff Arbuckle

I. Call to order at 10: 57 AM. Note taker: Patrick Patterson

II. Review of February minutes – the committee approved the minutes by consensus

III. Discuss/Debrief Observations from Accreditation Town Hall of 3/17/2016
   a. The committee wants to give special thanks to Ross Egloria for the efficient and high quality production of the PowerPoint used in the Town Hall meeting.
   b. Marcia noted that she is having an “Accreditation 2018” website put up on which to keep the campus up to date on the progress, issues and resources for the coming accreditation self-study. This is to help standard chairs identify resources, but also to provide open communication to the campus about the process and its progress.
   c. Yesterday’s Town Hall beat attendance expectations and was well-received
      i. The audience was also able to gain an understanding of the new elements of the ACCJC Requirements and the reasons for them, including political reasons and the increasing need for accountability.
   d. Now the AcTF needs to begin putting together self-study standard committees
      i. The AcTF can choose from the volunteer forms that were turned in
      ii. The AcTF should also begin the process of proactively inviting campus members to join.

1. We recognize, for example, that the schedules of CTE faculty are complex, and this makes meeting difficult, but their participation and leadership is critical to the self-study effort, so we should do our best to invite their participation.

2. Students on the self-study committees are important, but lack of success despite past work to include them suggests we should take a new approach. Rather than go through student government, perhaps the committee should solicit student participants through programs, clubs, and faculty recommendations, thus getting students who are ambitious and committed to the process.

3. The issue of co-chairs also came up. The committee agreed that the goal should be to get co-chairs who are fully committed to the process and the time involved.
   a. The AcTF consensus was that putting an administrator on every committee as co-chair is not a desirable strategy. This is because
      i. Faculty need experience in leadership
      ii. Administrators do not require that leadership activity for their career advancement
iii. Administrators have limited time, and in the past have often missed committee meetings even when acting as co-chairs.

iv. There is concern that administrators acting as co-chairs can have a damping effect on the self-study work of the committee.

4. The question of the co-chairs for the overall self-study is open. The AcTF members voiced support for the traditional system in which the ALO (Marcia) is joined by one other person to manage the process.

5. The decision on who will be overall chairs, and on the co-chairs for standard committees will be finalized by AcTF in April.

6. The committee was interested in the Quality Focus Essay presented yesterday. It appears to not replace the A.I.P. but allows us to get ahead of possible recommendations by showing that we are aware of and addressing issues.

7. We will also have to deal with issues in 2018 such as rail construction when we get ready for the visiting team.

8. The committee agreed that the Annual Report should be available on the web for the visiting team.

9. We would like ACCJC to put up training materials on the Web so that we can see more of what visiting teams are looking for. In that vein, the report of the administrators yesterday who were on a visiting team was useful.

10. The committee agreed that Sharepoint might be an important data repository but it has some issues.
    a. There is no longer an outward-facing component, so we will have to link Sharepoint data to a website we create ourselves.

IV. Discussion/Feedback for Annual Report Narrative Items
    a. This is the 3rd year that these narratives have been included in the annual report, which used to be exclusively data.
    b. We can make suggestions on things to include in these narratives.
    c. Question #38 Ross asked about the outward-facing component of Sharepoint. Pat answered that Sharepoint can function as an “Intranet” for campus constituents, but that its outward facing component has apparently been removed by Microsoft, thus making it necessary for us to link to a website of our own making. This can be done, however.
    d. Ross suggested that we create a working proof of concept to show what the visiting team will see by next fall, so that we can check on its viability.
    e. The committee agreed that we need an announcement about what needs to occur next.
    f. We need to house and be able to share SLO information. Pat noted that the SLO inventory is now available on Sharepoint and easy to use. This is potentially a very good place to store assessment data and allow access to it.
    g. #39 – Marcia asked for success stories. The committee noted that Speech and English have been doing extensive assessment, and probably have changes and success to
report. AMT has recently re-vamped its program and so SLOs so may have a change/success to report. In addition, AMT may be able to show success because of integration of EV repair and maintenance into the program, COSME probably has success stories to show due to assessment based changes, and History has been using assessment extensively, opening up the conversation about success and change to lecturers and finding ways to include all faculty in teaching discussions. In addition, UHWO is currently working on an Asian Studies Certificate linked through SLOs and requirements to the certificate at HCC.

h. The committee asked Marcia to check on the availability of release time at some point for Accreditation Self-study standard co-chairs.

V. Other Items

a. Does ACCJC require 2 years of math at college level for both CTE and Arts & Sciences degrees? – Marcia will check

b. What degree of accountability does the UHCC System have to ACCJC standards, and how does that affect the individual colleges?

i. The ACCJC cannot accredit a system, only an institution. However, institutional accreditation can be affected by system-level policies and so the system gets a review as part of accreditation. In order to keep the colleges accredited, we hope that the system will create and implement policies consistent with the accreditation requirements of ACCJC

1. Marcia has become part of a group on system policy and standards, the members of which have expressed a desire to continue meeting in order to help achieve just such a goal.

2. The committee wishes to register its hope that the UHCC system office will be a part of the accreditation process for the entire 2-year process, from the very beginning, and that the system will take part in planning and response to issues for which it has responsibility and/or some institutional connection.

VI. Adjourned 11:57 AM.

Respectfully submitted by Patrick Patterson