

**DABCC Accreditation Steering Committee
Informational Meeting
January 21, 2005**

MINUTES

Steering Committee

Present: Joyce Bradley, Tim Chappell, Anna Chieffo, Nancy Cross, Kristina Gordon, Pierre Laroche, Doug Layer, Fred Lillibridge, Martha McCaslin, Molly McGetrick, Kim Seifert, Rene Sierra, Susan Wood

Absent: Susan Williams

Administrative Liaisons

Present: Bernadette Montoya, Sylvia Nickerson, Mary Sletten, John Walker

Sub-Committee At Large Members

Present: Ji Cloteaux, Annja Cox, Earl Nissen

Recorder: Sherilyn Noble

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 p.m. during a working lunch.

Sub-Committee Reports

Criterion 1 – Nancy Cross and Tim Chappell, Co-Chairs

They assigned each member one core component of Criterion 1. There was a handout distributed showing the 5 core components taken from the Higher Learning Commission's "Handbook of Accreditation" Version 1:10/03 and the committee's findings. Stated that a mission statement exists, there was no vision statement or values statement and thought the mission statement was too wordy. The committee did not discuss the mission statement with Dr. Huerta. The mission statement states goals, but there is no evidence. They have not been able to find a paper trail. There is not an identifiable trail or process. Per NCA, the mission statement should be no longer than 25 words. There was discussion to rewrite the mission statement. If decision to rewrite mission statement, we would need everyone to buy into it. It would be up to the Executive Team to make the decision to rewrite it. The mission statement will overflow into all 5 criteria.

Criterion 2 – Molly McGetrick and Joyce Bradley, Co-Chairs

For core components 2A and 2B, there are a lot of documents that prove this such as, the PRIP process and the strategic plan. We do have a vision for the future. Share same concerns with the mission statement. All programs need a mechanism to communicate their specific needs. Theoretically there is, but there are a lot of gaps in those mechanisms.

There is a meeting scheduled on February 8 to review the PRIP reports and set priorities. Core 2C addresses the evaluation and assessment processes. There is an institution-wide weakness in terms of "data and feedback loops...to support continuous improvement." There are huge gaps in that minutes have not been posted by all committees in past 2 years. Not clear where to go to get all of the information. We need a document clearing house. In summary, the largest gaps are community involvement, integration of all planning, and documentation.

Criterion 3 – Rene Sierra and Susan Wood, Co-Chairs

There are four core components. There is not enough information to prove. We have a gap but sure we do have a process. There was a handout with the breakdown that listed what they considered to be the DABCC Academic Programs and the Non-credit Programs. There is not a model for us to collect this information. Tutoring has a system, does student services assist with student learning. The PRIP reports should inform Criterion 3. The PRIP reports are not understood. There are big gaps in institutional priorities. There will be a 2 year action plan. We will then have a framework once one PRIP reporting process is totally completed. There are 5 different self-studies that the committee members should review for some guidance. There was a worksheet distributed that they would like the other committee members to complete and return to them.

Criterion 4 – Martha McCaslin and Kim Seifert, Co-Chairs

Criterion 4 is well documented and the gaps are evident. Terminology is an issue. Under Core 4A, we are not a research driven college and this is not part of our mission statement. Documentation will be in one massive room, can we set up a place for information to be available electronically? Criterion 4 is probably the most currently documented one. North Western Iowa Community College's documentation is quite good. There is an employer satisfaction survey that some programs are currently using.

Criterion 5 – Doug Layer and Kristina Gordon, Co-Chairs

Criterion 5A and 5B are dependent on Criterion 1. A weakness is that if our mission statement is going to identify us as a "comprehensive" community college then we need to better define that and document how we serve those traditional students of a comprehensive community college. In conjunction with "comprehensive," we are also a designated Hispanic serving institution, and we need to document how we meet the needs of Hispanic students and those goals as well. Then we should compare our efforts to national averages and trends. One of Core component 5C weaknesses is what we do with our Latin American and African American constituencies. We need to document this. We need to be looking at all of our constituencies. How to we compare to national averages. We need tutoring for all courses other than developmental. Math course will be a good source for 5C and 5D. Another weakness would be how to keep us with growth, lack of staff, and course articulation. We need to take inventory of our services and connect those services with constituencies. This will help us to identify in a more meaningful way our specific strengths and weaknesses in serving each of our constituencies.

HLC Eligibility Process

This effort is going to be a high priority. We need to get organized and decide how we are going to go about achieving this. What we need to do right now is identify gaps. The first step is filing the Letter of Intent. Then we have one year to complete the Preliminary Information Form (PIF). This will allow

HLC to determine our eligibility for independent accreditation. The PIF has been described as a mini self-study. The PIF will make us self identify where the problems are and what we are going to do about it. We will also be working on our self study report at the same time as the PIF. We could be done in two years but may take three.

There are 12 steps included in this HLC Eligibility process. The eligibility requirements states you what documentation is required. How are we going to develop this work? There are financial reports available. Once the word get out we are seeking independent accreditation, we must stress that we will still be governed by the NMSU Board of Regents. We are not applying for stand alone independence. Independent accreditations will allow use to be reviewed by our peers (community college, not 4-year colleges). This is a significant challenge.

Co-chairs need to review the Preliminary Information Form (PIF) and see what is germane to your criterion and return your comments to Anna Chieffo and Fred Lillibridge prior to our next meeting on 18 February. Some of these steps will be fall under more than one criterion sub-committee. The PIF has been uploaded to our WebCT site. One idea that was suggested was to find other community colleges that could serve as good models. A team could visit them and learn how they approached this task. Forward your information about possible community college models to Sherilyn so she can start a list of possible models.

Susan Hatfield will be here April 14-16 to help us develop approaches to assess student learning. One goal is to get part-time faculty more involved because they teach 60% of our courses. Fred Lillibridge will coordinate Susan Hatfield's work at DABCC. One goal is to have her work with current committees to help them go their work.

Next Steps and Other Business

How often should we meet? No more than monthly. The committee decided to meet again February 18 at 3:30 in the ACR to discuss the 12 eligibility steps. The committee was reminded to review what parts of the PIF that are germane to their criterion, even if you think it overlaps another criterion. Send this information to Fred Lillibridge and Sherilyn by Monday, February 14. Co-chairs were also asked to update their sub-committee rosters.

Anna Chieffo and Fred Lillibridge will meet with Dr. Huerta to discuss the mission statement.

Susan Wood asked committee members for their NMSU log-in so she can create a WebCT site for this committee. [Note: This site was created and is operational].

Next meeting is scheduled for **February 18, at 3:30 p.m., in the ACR.**

Meeting adjourned at 1.45 p.m. For those who could stay, further discussion continued until 3:10 p.m.