

Standard I Accreditation Self Study Team
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
02-14-05 draft 2/16/05

Members Present: Andrew LaManque, Chair, Cindy Castillo,
Carlene Bruins, Kevin Glapion, Carolyn Keen,
Lydia Hearn, Duane Kubo, Carolyn Wilkins-Greene,
Carmen Pereida, Pat Fifield

Members Absent: Christina Espinosa-Pieb, Rich Hansen, Mayra Cruz
Student representative

Handouts: Minutes from 2-7-05
Notes from IPTB 2-8-05
Data Andrew shared at campus meeting 2-11-05

Duane began discussion on the results of the accreditation survey as they related to Standard B3. Respondents seem to indicate that the process of program review was fair, but when it comes to the allocation of funds there seems to be a perception that the process was not fair.

The discussion centered on why people thought the seemingly contradictory results came out the way they did. For example, there are more people involved in the front-end process of program review. There is less participation after it is submitted. You don't necessarily get what you want so it is perceived as unfair. Program review is concrete.

Judy makes decisions after input from the committee. She provides feedback to the committee on the results (see attached IBPT documentation), but it appears that departmental personnel are not getting the same feedback and thus may perceive that the loop is not closed for them – they see the initial data and then hear about the decision but might not hear information on how the decision was made.

Almost all program reviews state we need more money and more staff. If you don't get what you want, you feel it is unfair. You invest a lot of time in program review. You feel you should get something. In surveys many people vent. One of the problems with program review is that it does not require a prioritization of data/indicators. There is no consensus on what is most important – productivity, student success for underrepresented groups, contributions to the community, etc. Lydia Hearn will provide her list of indicators to IPBT, but the list will need to be prioritized if it is to be most useful for decision-making.

We need to continue to do surveys on satisfaction with the institution on an annual basis, not just every 6 years. Our last accreditation was during better budget times. Surveys are helpful in obtaining the pulse of the campus.

Discussion on Standard B4.

Duane suggested that the Planning Agenda include a recommendation on ways to increase student participation on shared governance committees. This also was discussion at the all-college accreditation meeting the previous week. We may be asking students to serve on too many committees. Maybe they feel they only have a small voice. Some committees may be too overwhelming for them. We need to provide an environment of equal voice. They should serve for a year. We should think about providing students with the equivalent of release time for the meetings. These meetings could be like a class. We could make student committee work a job. The consensus of the group was that we should propose some type of class for students who serve on committees to gain academic credit since learning is taking place.

Carolyn Keen had discussion on Standard 1B1.

In the Ed Master Plan we have specific goals, but there does not appear to be a routine structural follow up. The State of the College report does assess indicators of quality but not always in relationship to specific numerical targets. The strategic plan should help address this by developing a new set of measurable outcomes that can be evaluated each year.

Next meeting 2-28-05.

Please review all notes and visit web sites.