

ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

April 2, 2015

5:00 PM – Education Center, Room 137

MEMBERS:

Dottie Evans (Facilitator)
Glenn Jackson
Ricky Barnes
Paul Clark
Tina Smith
Scott Mickelsen (Absent)

Becky Currie (Absent)
Jo Bek (Absent)
Brad Ramsdale
Jan Price (Recorder)
Jennifer McConville
Eric Reed

The Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm with the above referenced individuals in attendance.

WELCOME

- ◆ Dottie Evans welcomed everyone to the meeting.

MINUTES FROM MARCH 19, 2015

- ◆ Eric Reed noted the correction of “taylor” to “tailor” in the minutes from March 19. Motion by Paul Clark to approve the minutes as corrected, second by Eric Reed.

TAKE-AWAYS FROM 2015 HLC CONFERENCE

- ◆ Dottie reviewed key points from the conference
- ◆ What are the areas that the reviewers will focus on within the review process?
 - Assessment, assessment, assessment
 - Emphasis on continuous improvement
 - Strategic Planning, especially as it is grounded in fiscal realities
 - Adequacy of funding for future plans
 - Diversity Plan
 - Dual Credit
 - Distance Learning
- ◆ We will need to be able to articulate the details of our writing when they visit
 - Develop talking points for each criterion
 - Identify spokesperson for each criterion
- ◆ What are the specific Federal Compliance issues that will be focused on during the visit? (Scott will be focusing on this)
 - Student complaint process
 - Policies
 - Dual credit
 - Distance Learning
 - Credit hour

- ◆ Why is the Standard Pathway word count 40K?
 - Gives 5,000 words to emphasize improvement, especially for areas of concern from the last review. (Must address assurance points)
 - For NCTA we must specifically address
 - General Education improvements
 - Assessment improvements
 - Budgeting & funding improvements
 - Dottie will provide the current word count for our writing

- ◆ What is concise, targeted writing?
 - Should include a short narrative about what evidence is being offered, a link to that evidence and an explanation why the evidence makes a strong argument
 - Metro Community College used 21,000 words and numerous bullet points while Pittsburgh State used much more narrative and 32,500 words. Both were successfully reaffirmed
 - Writing should focus on the arguments associated with the 21 core components (Team will look at closely)
 - The sub component helps to identify potential evidence but is not all inclusive (Make sure to explain evidence)

- ◆ What is the link between Federal Compliance and Criterion 2?
 - These two areas are asking for similar information
 - Have those writing about Federal Compliance and Criterion 2 work closely together

- ◆ In general, what arguments are reviewers finding require more attention from institutions reviewed to date?
 - 4.A The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs
 - 4.B The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning
 - 4.C The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning
 - 5.1A The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future
 - 5.1C The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning

- ◆ What are some of the logistics involved with the HLC Opinion Survey?
 - Web link will be sent to institution 3 months before visit (end of December for NCTA)
 - Needs to be available for students for 10 days
 - Advertise via
 - Student listserv
 - Website
 - Facebook (?)
 - Send reminders about completing the survey during the 10 day period
 - Helps to improve response rate
 - Helps to overcome early respondent bias
 - Be sure to include dual credit and distance learning students in the survey

- ◆ How can we get direct feedback on writing from the HLC when our arguments are still in draft form?
 - HLC liaisons will review draft writing and give feedback if requested, approximately a year out from the team visit. (Dottie will request)
 - NCTA will be receiving this invite soon. Challenge yourself to have as close to a final draft as possible for this review

- ◆ What type of organizational structure is effective for the PDF files saved within the assurance system?
 - General consensus of reviewers is:
 - Each Criterion has its own folder
 - Under that folder are the documents labeled by sub component
 - 4B1.document title.date.pdf

- ◆ What is the easiest way for the public and the review team to find information on an institutional website?
 - Have a dedicated page called “Public Information”
 - Be certain the “Mark of Affiliation” is displayed on the accreditation page
 - Available through the marketing department of the HLC

The committee discussed the above topics. The document is only the starting point. The visit is very important. Key people are needed during the visit. Talking points should be developed in advance for each criterion.

REVIEW OF WRITING

- ◆ Dr. Rosati would like to read the additional writing that has been completed since the first review. Please be prepared to have additions, revisions and corrections available for Dr. Rosati to read in two weeks, April 16.

LOGISTICS OF MEETING DURING WEEK OF MAY 11

- ◆ Looking at Tuesday, May 12. Divide into 5 groups, discuss and provide specific feedback for each criterion. Suggested time, 10:00 am – 12:00 noon, lunch provided. Assign individuals to a specific group and then rotate to another group discussion if desired.
 - Final review during August In-Service

NEXT MEETING

- ◆ Thursday, April 9, 2015, 5:00 pm, Ag Hall Conference Room.

MEETING AJOURNED

- ◆ Motion by Tina Smith to adjourn, second by Dr. Barnes