

**DACC Accreditation Steering Committee
Planning Meeting
April 19, 2007**

MINUTES

Steering Committee

Present: Anna Chieffo, Fred Lillibridge, Susan Williams, Susan Wood, Dave Burleson, Joyce Bradley, Tammy Welch (for Molly Morris), Rene Sierra, Kim Seifert, Ellen Schneider, Doug Layer, Brad Mazdra, Annja Cox, Stephen DeGiulio, Josie Lannert, Ann Gutierrez

Absent: Molly Morris, Tim Chappell, LaVonne Brown, Martha McCaslin

Administrative Liaisons

Present: John Walker, Margie Huerta

Recorder: Stephanie Haan-Amato

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

Approve Minutes

The 15 March 2007 minutes were approved as presented.

Co-Coordinator's Progress Report

Fred Lillibridge gave a brief overview of the six Strategic Priorities, which are the focus of the 2008-2012 DACC Strategic Plan. He stressed that the strategic planning process is linked to the accreditation self-study. Anna Chieffo added that the gaps identified by the Accreditation Steering Committee were considered in the strategic planning process and are being folded into the new Strategic Plan. She also said that this was done with the PRIP process via an added section on PRIP forms for DACC offices to identify the connections between their PRIP goals and HLC Accreditation Criterion.

Anna Chieffo reported that an All College Meeting is being planned for early summer to give the college community a status report on the accreditation effort and self-study. She said that it will likely be in the commons in the form of an ice cream social, and the Accreditation Steering Committee will be seeking input from the college community during the meeting. Doug Layer suggested that the committee consider moving the meeting to the fall to encourage greater attendance.

Fred Lillibridge reviewed the revised HLC timeline and said that two items (29 & 30) were recently added to reflect the activities that will occur after the self-study visit in April 2008.

Fred Lillibridge said that the eight attendees of the HLC Annual Meeting in Chicago were ready to travel to the meeting. The attendees were Kim Seifert, Susan Wood, John Walker, Margie Huerta, Anna Chieffo, David Burleson, Ellen Schneider, and Fred Lillibridge. Susan Wood encouraged all attendees to review the samples of self studies available at the meeting.

Anna Chieffo announced that a questionnaire to solicit student input was developed and distributed to students at the Spring Festival. Kim Seifert asked whether the committee would like the questionnaire to be given to students in classes, and the committee agreed that it would be beneficial to solicit as much feedback as possible.

Self Study Editor Report

Susan Wood said that she compiled the gaps forms into a matrix of summarized gaps to include in the self-study. The matrix included action plans, responsible persons, timetables, and statuses for each identified gap.

Susan Wood reported that she needs final drafts of each Criterion Co-Chair's chapter of the self-study by May 14.

HLC Communications Progress Report

Susan Williams said that she would appreciate feedback regarding methods to promote the accreditation effort.

Joyce Bradley suggested sending a questionnaire brochure to all faculty and staff through intercampus mail, and to encourage participation, she suggested entering the names of all participants into a drawing for a \$50 gift certificate. Fred Lillibridge asked that the committee brainstorm about ideas for promotion and sent them to Susan Williams.

Criterion 3c & d Self Study Review

Rene Sierra presented a summary of the Criterion 3c & d self-study draft via PowerPoint presentation.

Rene Sierra reviewed the evidence for the learning resources available at DACC. The strengths were: computer labs and classrooms, math adaptive technology for students with disabilities, ESL advising and courses, specialized technology labs in Health and Career-Technical programs, dual credit program, Next Step program (Gadsden), computer open labs at all campuses, and distance education.

He added that his subcommittee identified several additional learning environments, and he passed out a form to committee members and asked for their input for more additional learning environments. The environments that his subcommittee identified were: DACC student clubs

(e.g. Math Club, groups to review for comprehensive exams), institutional fairs and celebrations (e.g. Career Fair, MiniWorld), and open forums (e.g. Confronting the Fear of the Other forum).

Rene Sierra identified as a gap that the ESL program is fragmented and lacks program standardization and continuity. Brad Mazdra added that there is not an institutional mechanism to catch English Language Learners when they begin at the college. Susan Wood said that two or three ESL-related task forces have recommended that a position be created to coordinate the ESL program. Stephen DeGiulio said that the program should be promoted to encourage students to self identify as English Language Learners so that they are able to receive the help they need.

Rene cited the following as evidence that DACC's learning resources support student learning and effective teaching: Financial Aid, Veteran's Services, Counseling, Services for Students with Disabilities, Career Counseling, Career Placement and Cooperative Education Services, DACC Bookstore, Campus Security, Academic Advising, Student Services Testing Center, program specific advising, specialized software in the Health and Career-Technical programs, and the Math Testing Center.

Another gap that Rene Sierra identified was that incorrect student addresses and phone numbers create difficulties for academic and non-academic areas at DACC. Brad Mazdra agreed to investigate the possibility of incorporating a screen prompting students to verify their contact information when they register or check grades online.

Executive Team Response to HLC Gaps

Margie Huerta reviewed the gap identified by criterion 5 regarding square footage per student. She said that construction costs have increased greatly, and because of the college budget, DACC is unable to match the 200 square feet per student of our peer institutions.

Margie Huerta addressed the gap identified by criterion 5 that advising at DACC seems fragmented with potential for confusion among students as to how to be effectively advised. She said that she decided that advising should occur within divisions because division advisors know their programs, and it is efficient for students. Anna Chieffo added that the college is moving away from the old practice of students visiting advisors only once by promoting a multi-faceted relationship between students and advisors. Brad Mazdra said that there is coordination among advisors in the college, which occurs during monthly meetings, but he has seen student confusion about the structure of advising at DACC because there are so many layers. Doug Layer said that while it is beneficial to have advisors in divisions, students do not know to whom they should go to have their various questions answered. Anna Chieffo responded that there is a trifold brochure that explains the functions of each of the advising areas, but she said that it could be improved. She then said that the catalog and schedule should be revised to include information about advising as well.

Margie Huerta then discussed the gap identified by criterion 5 that DACC does not administer its own Employee Climate Survey. She said that she does not believe there would be enough response to a climate survey based on the meager response that was received on the last two

surveys recently administered to the college community, the Strategic Plan Survey and the Accreditation Online Short Course and Surveys. Fred Lillibridge added that both of the recent surveys were promoted in several ways to encourage people to complete them, but the response rates were very low.

Anna Chieffo addressed the gap identified by criterion 5 that DACC does not offer online-delivered tutoring for students in distance education courses. She said that she met with Mozella Garcia about this, and the result was that the online software was too costly. Doug Layer said that the concern of criterion 5 was that DACC offers many of their courses online, but distance students do not receive equitable services. Susan Wood added that HLC has identified distance education as an area of concern, and this should be addressed. Brad Mazdra said that it is possible to offer services through WebCT (Blackboard in the future) as a non-credit course.

Anna Chieffo then discussed the gap identified by criterion 5 regarding confusion about how students with disabilities engage in tutoring services (Students with Disabilities Office or Student Success Center). She said that students who need accommodations are tutored in the Students with Disabilities Office because that is where the necessary assistive technology is located.

Margie Huerta addressed the gap identified by criterion 5 that the role of DACC's Human Resources director could be better defined as it relates to NMSU's personnel department. She said that all Human Resources decisions must be approved through NMSU.

Margie Huerta said that she would like to see a plan from the Publicity and Promotion Subcommittee for promotion of the accreditation effort.

Criterion 5 Self Study Review

Doug Layer and Ellen Schneider presented a summary of the criterion 5 self-study draft via PowerPoint presentation (see handout).

They identified that the strengths for criterion 5a were: success with local bond issues, assessment of community needs guide development of new programs, Lumina Grant focuses on improving success rates of Hispanic males, and continuing education and customized training are available to external constituents.

The strengths identified in regard to criterion 5b were: expansion of East Mesa facility, plans to build campuses in Hatch and Chaparral, designation of funds to purchase equipment and expand programs, co-op programs, Student Success Center, and Advising Center. They reported that the gaps of criterion 5b were: the square foot per student ratio is low, distance education capacity is unclear, tutoring services at satellite campuses are inconsistent, tutoring for distance students is not available, a centralized testing center is non-existent, advising organizational structure may be unclear, and student to advisor ratio is high.

Doug Layer and Ellen Schneider reported that the strengths for criterion 5c were: dual credit program; high school linkages committees in math, reading, and English; Bridge Program; transfer policies; database for fundraising efforts; local funding for scholarships; eRecruiting

online program, new website under construction, and Career Fairs in Career Placement. The gaps were: lack of alumni association, fundraising difficulties between DACC and NMSU, lack of fundraising coordinator, and making earlier contact with students and increasing awareness of Career Placement.

The strengths identified for criterion 5d were: campus available for community use, workforce education, service learning initiatives, college activities involve members from the community, and CCSSE administer each semester. The gaps identified for criterion 5d were: future of service learning is unclear, role of DACC Human Resources Director in relation to NMSU's personnel department is unclear, and there is not a climate survey solely for DACC.

Doug Layer and Ellen Schneider presented additional evidence for criterion 5 from the CCSSE and NMSU Climate Survey results.

General Discussion

Decision: The committee agreed to cancel the 17 May 2007 Steering Committee meeting.

The committee decided that committee members should be surveyed about the importance of each of the gaps in order to provide input into the decision about which gaps will be included in the self-study.

Decision: Stephanie Haan-Amato will draft a survey and send it to committee members via intercampus mail.

Next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 21 June 2007 at 3:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.