

**DACC Accreditation Steering Committee
Planning Meeting
March 15, 2007**

MINUTES

Steering Committee

Present: Anna Chieffo, Fred Lillibridge, Susan Williams, Susan Wood, Tim Chappell, Joyce Bradley, Molly Morris, Rene Sierra, Susan Wood, Kim Seifert, Martha McCaslin, Ellen Schneider, Rita Gonzalez, Susana Navarrette Rodriguez, Sylvia Nickerson

Absent: Dave Burleson, Doug Layer, LaVonne Brown

Administrative Liaisons

Present: John Walker, Brad Mazdra (for Ike Ledesma)

Recorders: Stephanie Haan-Amato and Sherilyn Noble

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Approve Minutes

The 1 March 2007 minutes were approved as presented.

Co-Coordinator's Progress Report

Fred Lillibridge reported that Dr. Huerta would likely not be able to make it to the Steering Committee meeting today because of a meeting in Santa Fe.

Anna Chieffo asked whether there were any questions regarding the HLC annual meeting in Chicago April 20-24, 2007. She said that Vicki Haggard was registering attendees and preparing necessary travel forms.

Anna Chieffo reported that the Business and Information Systems Division (B&I) ACBSP site visit for accreditation went very well. She said that a great deal was learned, and the good practices employed by B&I will be able to be used for the HLC site visit, especially in regard to their resource room. Kim Seifert added that the employees who conducted the site visit were very helpful with highlighting the strengths of DACC. Susan Wood asked who coordinated the resource room and whether they would be willing to help with the HLC resource room. Kim Seifert replied that Lydia Bagwell and Hilda Perez were largely responsible for setting it up, and they would be available for consultation.

Criterion 3a & b Self Study Review

Susan Wood announced that there would be an Assessment Tea on April 12, 2007.

Susan Wood presented a summary of the Criterion 3a & b self-study draft via PowerPoint presentation (see handout).

Susan Wood reported that one of the strengths identified for component 3a was standardized capstone courses. Ellen Schneider asked for an explanation of capstone courses, and Tim Chappell gave an example of the capstone course in the Computer and Information Technology Department.

Susan Wood identified another strength for component 3a, the Bridge Program, and Anna Chieffo gave a brief description of the program. Susan Wood also said that the assessment plans in some non-credit programs was a strength for component 3a, and Susana Navarrette Rodriguez reported that Adult Basic Education has both local and state assessment procedures.

Susan Wood identified another strength for component 3a, the General Education Assessment Plan and Committee Structure. She said that assessment artifacts are designed by instructors based on a critical thinking rubric that is sent out by email to all faculty members from the General Education Assessment committee.

Susan Wood reported that one of the gaps identified for component 3a was the Program Assessment Reports, which have been received with insufficient data or have not been submitted. Anna Chieffo said that she will be reviewing the reports along with Susan Wood.

Susan Wood said that one of the strengths identified for component 3b was the opportunities and budget for Professional Development. She said that their portion of the self-study contained data about speakers who have given training on campus and funding amounts for development and travel.

Susan Wood reported that one of the gaps identified for component 3b was that there is not a central testing area. Molly Morris said that there will be a full tutoring center at East Mesa Center, which is planned for Phase 4.

Criterion 4 Self Study Review

Martha McCaslin and Kim Seifert passed out copies of the Criterion 4 self-study draft (see handout) and presented a summary via PowerPoint presentation ([Click here for PowerPoint](#)).

Action Item: They agreed to email their PowerPoint presentation to Stephanie Haan-Amato.

Martha McCaslin began the presentation by identifying Criterion 4 gaps. She said that there is not a career ladder available for non-exempt employees. Fred Lillibridge asked about the official DACC definitions for 'part-time' and 'adjunct' faculty. Anna Chieffo replied that she generally uses the term 'part-time.' She said that Donna Alden was once asked about the definitions, and

she suggested following up with Donna Alden to be sure. She said that she believes that an 'adjunct' is a visiting faculty member, and a 'part-time' faculty member is one who DACC hires from semester to semester. The committee agreed that the college should do more for part-time faculty members.

Kim Seifert identified a gap for component 4c, the need for a programmed curriculum evaluation process or timeline. He added that now that the curriculum review is handled by the division, committees are uncertain about the process.

Susan Wood said that we need more information about the careers of DACC graduates from Ken Tellez in Career Placement, especially with regard to NM Career Clusters. Susana Navarrette Rodriguez said that Adult Basic Education has a post-graduate questionnaire, which helps to determine what happens to students after they graduate. Fred Lillibridge suggested that it seemed to work better when every department collected data on DACC graduates independently.

It was suggested that Martha McCaslin and Kim Seifert amend component 4d to include a discussion of the level of confidentiality of the college when handling data. Molly Morris added that when staff people stay current in their fields, they add to the ethical integrity of the college.

General Discussion

Susan Williams reported that the Accreditation Newsletter keeps getting pushed back. She added that the newsletter should be published in hardcopy form.

Sylvia Nickerson suggested holding a follow-up meeting with all members of the criterion subcommittees and announcing it at convocation.

Susan Williams said that the committee needs more student feedback. She also said that the mission statement should be posted at all DACC locations.

Fred Lillibridge reported that Dr. Huerta will provide more feedback about the gaps identified by the criterion subcommittees in the future. He added that, at the next meeting, Rene Sierra will be presenting the self-study draft for Criterion 3c & d, and Doug Layer and Ellen Schneider will be presenting Criterion 5. He also asked that the criterion co-chairs, who have not already done so, send their criterion gap forms to him as soon as possible so that he can meet with Dr. Huerta about them.

Decision: The committee agreed that the resources gathered for the Business and Information Systems Division (B&I) ACBSP site visit resource room should be transferred to the HLC Resource room in room 93.

Next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 19 April 2007 at 3:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.