

**HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE**

**AGENDA  
March 15, 2017**

---

**Members Present:** Standard I: David Panisnick, Bed Paudyal (for Keala Chock); Standard II: Jolene Suda; Standard III: Steven Auerbach, Jeff Stearns; Standard IV: Cynthia Smith; Mike Meyer (IT Liaison); Jeffery Arbuckle (IR Liaison); Marcia Roberts-Deutsch (ISER Chair)

**Status Reports from Standard Co-Chairs:**

Standard I: IA continues to meet weekly and has set an internal deadline prior to Spring Break so that David Panisnick can begin working on the first draft during that time. Bed Paudyal reported that IB is using Excel to keep track of its work but had questions about the budgeting process. In a discussion about the format for writing, it was recommended that teams take a look at the Chaffey model, as noted by VP Morton, as a good example (<http://libguides.chaffey.edu/accreditation>). This site has links to their 2016 report and other relevant documents.

Standard II: Jeff Stearns reported on the February 27 meeting for all of Standard II. He is working on the first draft for IIA, after an initial deadline for data-gathering of March 8. Jolene indicated that IIB hasn't finalized items for the survey; she is also assisting IIC. Cynthia Smith asked about how we are handling DE discussion (IIA and elsewhere); Marcia indicated that it is likely that we will address DE-related items in the context of each Standard, but may also create a separate DE section for cross-reference.

Standard III: Steven Auerbach said that there would be a leads meeting the week of March 20. This Standard is eager to move ahead with the survey items, especially for IIIA and IIIB. The system has now posted information relevant to IIID. For IIIC, Mike Meyer indicated that he has written a substantial portion of that section already, since it deals mostly with his area; he is using OneNote in Sharepoint for this purpose. He is also waiting to hear back from the IRB so that he can proceed with administering the Tech survey from EduCause.

Standard IV: Cynthia Smith indicated that work had been assigned to prepare an initial draft. Focus groups were convened last week to discuss campus governance issues, and some items that could be addressed immediately, since as communication, were identified. Conred Maddox will represent the team at system meetings regarding Section C, and Silvan Chung will represent the team at system meetings regarding Section D.

The Steering Committee reconfirmed the due date of April 10 for working drafts.

**Surveys Status Report and Next Steps:**

In February, the Steering Committee reviewed the survey items submitted by the various parts of Standards, and forwarded that material to the Accreditation Task

Force with the understanding that they would finalize and implement the survey according to the proposed timetable. That was not done, so the timing of the general campus survey has yet to be determined. In the meantime, several smaller focused surveys will be implemented (e.g., Academic Resources, Technology). Marcia will let the campus know that these will be forthcoming, and encourage good participation.

### **Follow-up Items:**

Several items were identified in February as needing follow-up / more discussion and other items have surfaced as well, as follows:

- Evidence needs: As writing proceeds and evidence gathering continues, teams are reminded to identify needs and let Marcia and the Steering Committee know if evidence or additional documentation is needed to support the narrative.
- Data visualization (graphics): Teams and writers should consider how best to convey information and supplement the narrative. This can include tables, charts, graphics, etc. We will also consider the incorporation of sidebars or vignettes (e.g., student voices) to augment the report.
- Follow up on SLO/PLO/ILO alignment documentation: This key issue, raised by the Chancellor is one that the Deans and unit heads should be working on now, to ensure that we have sufficient documentation in this area.
- Interviews with Administrative team: Cynthia Smith indicated that this is likely something that will be done in the Fall.
- Template for Writing: See above; the “Chaffey model” is recommended.
- Clarification of roles – Steering Committee and AcTF: Steven Auerbach indicated that there is still confusion about the respective roles of these two bodies. Marcia will clarify with a side-by-side comparison.
- System v. Campus responsibilities: There is more emphasis in this cycle on coordination among the CC campuses around issues that pertain to all. Discussion has already begun in connection with Standard IVC and IVD, as well as Standard IIIA and IIID. There may be other areas relating to system-level initiatives that may be managed in the same way (e.g., Student Success Pathways; Developmental Education.)
- Integrating Students into the Self-Study process: While it may be problematic to try to identify student members of the individual teams, it was recommended that we try to get a student representative on the Steering Committee. Marcia will follow up with Emily Kukulies.

### **Steering Committee Membership and Meeting schedule:**

Marcia expressed concern that the current structure has not been totally effective in getting information out to the parts of standards and suggested that each part of standard be represented on the Steering Committee. The committee concurred; Marcia will contact liaisons from the parts of standards not already represented. The committee also set a date for its next meeting.

**NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2:00 PM**