

**DABCC Accreditation Steering Committee
Planning Meeting
May 11, 2006**

MINUTES

Steering Committee

Present: Kristina Gordon, Doug Layer, Molly Morris, Kim Seifert, Tim Chappell, Anna Chieffo, Fred Lillibridge, Susan Williams, Rene Sierra, Susan Wood

Absent: Nancy Cross, Joyce Bradley, Martha McCaslin

Administrative Liaisons

Present: John Walker, Andy Burke, Ike Ledesma

Recorder: Stephanie Haan

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

Approve Minutes

The 20 April 2006 minutes were approved with minor editing.

Co-Coordination Progress Report

Anna Chieffo provided an update on the HLC/FOE Thank You party to be held on May 17, 2006 from 5:00 – 7:00 p.m. in the Stan Fulton Center.

PIF Status Report

Fred Lillibridge said that he inquired with Margie Huerta about the status of the PIF, and Dr. Huerta said that HLC had contacted her and that her confidence is high. Anna Chieffo reported that it is possible that the DABCC site visit will be on the same dates as the site visit to NMSU, which are April 28 – 29, 2006.

Organizing for a successful self-study

1. *Case for self-study coordinator:* Doug Layer summarized his proposal brief to create the position of self-study coordinator (SSC). He said that, based on the presentations he attended at the conference, a separate SSC seemed like a “given” for achieving an exemplary accreditation. He proposed that the SSC would develop a timeline for the completion of the self-study; ensure that the criterion committee co-chairs were gathering the necessary documentation; create, coordinate, and maintain the resource room for the final site visit; facilitate the writing and editing of the self-study; and perform other duties deemed necessary by the steering committee. Susan Williams suggested that we may need a full-time person to carry out all of these duties. Fred Lillibridge said that the idea would have to be proposed to

the administration because it might require a full-time person or a faculty person with release time.

Kristina Gordon asked if part of the suggested duties of the SSC would be the job of the editor, specifically facilitating the writing and editing of the self-study. Susan Wood said that the editor would not likely be doing the writing. Rene Sierra said that the steering committee should provide guidance and suggest tasks, and the SSC should make sure the tasks are carried out. Ike Ledesma suggested that some duties could be done by the Administrative Liaisons.

Kristina Gordon suggested that the SSC could work with Susan Wood to provide a template for the co-chairs that defined the necessary elements for inclusion in the self-study. Andy Burke said that the subcommittee co-chairs should keep in mind that their subcommittees should bring their own ideas and backgrounds to the self-study in addition to the requirements in the proposed templates. Anna Chieffo said that creating the timeline would be fairly simple since there is a timeline in existence from Institutional Priority Two, and Fred Lillibridge added that the responsibility of the SSC would also be to ensure that the timeline is implemented and followed. Anna Chieffo stated that it was early in the self-study period to know whether the college would need a SSC since we had not yet started gathering information for the writing of the self-study. Tim Chappell suggested that some of the responsibilities of Anna Chieffo and Fred Lillibridge would become the responsibilities of the SSC.

Overall, the group agreed that the duties of the SSC would be to make sure everyone in the steering committee was completing their responsibilities and to provide some guidance.

2. *Specific subcommittee charges:* Rene Sierra gave a brief overview of his handout on the subcommittee charges. He said that he felt that he needed to make a timeline before he could draft the charges, and he summarized the timeline he created. Fred Lillibridge said that the steering committee should compare Rene's timeline to the existing timeline from the strategic plan and update it.

Fred Lillibridge asked if everyone thought that the five subcommittees focused on the criterion was the best way to be organized. Tim Chappell said no. Kristina Gordon asked what another method for organization would be. Susan Williams said that another way to organize would be thematic. Susan Wood said that yet another way would be to leave the subcommittees as they are but to remove the criterion numbers when doing the research and then bring all of the pieces together and organize the self-study by criterion numbers in the end. Tim Chappell said that he understood that all of the criterion were supposed to be interwoven throughout the self-study, and he did not understand how that could happen if the five subcommittees were left as they are.

Susan Wood proposed that the steering committee should design a survey to collect data that would go out to officers and administrators. She also proposed the creation of a data collection committee who would give the collected data and information to the subcommittees. Anna Chieffo said that the subcommittees could take the information and mesh it with the ideas that they had already been working on. Susan Williams suggested that each of the five subcommittees should interweave the four themes into their portion of the document. Doug Layer commented that he thinks the five subcommittees may not be the most effective way to be organized. Kristina Gordon suggested waiting to reorganize until after the results from the survey were compiled.

Molly Morris suggested that there should be a point at which the entire committee will weigh in on the entire self-study document. She said that the committee may need to set aside time for each subcommittee to present their portion. Anna Chieffo agreed that the entire committee (Steering Committee plus subcommittees) should be included so that each subcommittee is aware of the activities of the other subcommittees. She suggested at least four meetings in which everyone from the steering committee would attend and the subcommittees would explain their points. Tim Chappell suggested that the meetings could be organized into a retreat in which each subcommittee would sponsor a portion to present their ideas.

Decision: The committee agreed that the five subcommittees focused on the criterion was the most effective way to be organized for now, but everyone recognized that the criterion could not be kept completely separate. The committee agreed that the self-study should be written using a holistic view with the four themes woven throughout.

3. *Survey creation:* As previously noted, Susan Wood proposed that the steering committee should create a survey to be sent out to officers and administrators to collect data and information to be used in the self-study. Anna Chieffo said the survey would be a great mechanism to obtain a large amount of information from a large number of people. Susan Wood said that the survey would not be made up of questions for which answers are on a Likert scale, but it would be more of a questionnaire. Doug Layer suggested that the survey could be conducted in tiers in which one tier would be collected and summarized, and in response, another tier of questions would be sent out.

Decision: The committee agreed that the survey should be developed sooner than later and that it should be broad and simple.

4. *Publicity and promotion workgroup:* Molly Morris summarized a proposal for publicity and promotion, which she coauthored with Susan Williams. The proposal is printed below:

We believe that a Publicity and Promotion Workgroup should be created, under the leadership of the HLC steering committee, and in cooperation with existing committees and task forces as needed. The charge of this workgroup would be to organize and implement the following activities to involve the whole community in the “accreditation movement:”

- Organize a two-hour accreditation segment during the Fall 2006 Professional Development Day. This segment of Professional Development Day activities would be open to **all** faculty and staff, and would feature games, prizes and snacks, as modeled after the recent “Let the Games Begin” HLC Conference presentation.
- Create an online accreditation mini-course that would be a combination instructional and evidence-gathering tool (via survey questions and input sections). Everyone would be strongly encouraged to take the course--once at the beginning of the accreditation process, and once again before the visit. In this way we could evaluate progress.
- Produce a quarterly *Chronicle of Accreditation* newsletter. The first would feature a *What is Accreditation?* Q & A section, and an update on progress thus far.
- Investigate using an RSS feed within Banner, and/or regular pop-up blurbs or a blog to keep the community informed about the “accreditation movement.”
- Establish a regular presence at departmental and division meeting, featuring games, spot quizzes, and (of course!) prizes. This would be organized by P & P Workgroup members, working with department heads.

Molly Morris stressed that the mini-course is a very important component of this proposal. She said that it would really help to create a movement of all strata of the college. Susan Wood said that she would help with the questions for the mini-course because she and Fred Lillibridge had already brainstormed on questions that would be appropriate for this.

Decision: Susan Williams agreed to chair the Publicity and Promotion Workgroup.

5. *Resolution of identified areas for improvement:* Fred Lillibridge asked what should be done when the committee identifies an area for improvement to ensure that a plan for rectification is developed. Tim Chappell suggested putting the items in the minutes and agenda for each steering committee meeting until the item is resolved. Molly Morris asked how to solve issues that are more institutional in nature. Fred Lillibridge suggested having a bullet on the agendas of each of the Administrative Liaisons for the Friday meetings of the four top officers. Anna Chieffo said that the ideas from the subcommittee meetings could be taken to the Friday meetings. Fred Lillibridge also suggested keeping an ongoing list of these issues.

Overall, the committee agreed that issues should be identified, catalogued, discussed at the Steering Committee level, and then presented to respective administrators.

Decision: Tim Chappell and Doug Layer agreed to write up plans regarding their ideas for the most effective methods for ensuring that issues are resolved.

General Discussion

Fred Lillibridge asked if the committee would agree to change the steering committee meeting time from 3:30 to 3:00 p.m.

Decision: The steering committee agreed to change the meeting time to 3:00 p.m. (remaining on the third Thursday of every month).

Next meeting is scheduled for 15 June 2006 at **3:00 p.m. (please note new time)**.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.