SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
November 5, 2009

Attendees: Rita Myles, Kevin Hastings, Kim Mills, Pam Lau, Terry Adcock, Amy Penne, Paul Sarantakos, Randy Fletcher, Dr. Linda Moore, Dr. Seamus Reilly, Dr. Tom Ramage, Dr. Kris Young, Dave Leake.

Absent: Lin Warfel, Lori Sprague, Kevin Knott, Don Nolan

1. Amy Penne asked each of the criterion chairs to give a short synopsis of recent activities
   I. Kevin Hastings reported that the criterion #1 team has met 4-5 times this year and noted that it advantageous for them to set the dates for all meetings early in the semester. They have identified items to investigate by reading the 2002 self-study document. They have a good, productive group who are ready to examine the mission documents. Dr. Ramage added that the “open comment” period for the newly drafted mission statement closes November 11. Feedback has been very good so far.

   II. Pam Lau stated the criterion #2 team has met twice. The first time they focused on core component “a” and then “b” was the focus of the second meeting. They are looking at the planning process with component “b” specifically being on the financial framework at the college. CFO Chris Randles provided answers to questions at that meeting. Some of the questions were generated by looking at what other college had done to address this core component. Given the success of this session, it was suggested that Chris doing this same impromptu presentation in the college theatre to clarify financial processes. Pam noted that financial matters were mentioned in other criteria and asked for assistance as to how to proceed. It is preferred that any financial references be linked back to criterion #2 and, in the virtual document, these links will be live. Any linking should open a new window, however, so the reviewer does not lose their place in the main document.

   III. Terry Adcock’s group has only met once, but their meeting was very productive. They have divided into four groups with each taking a core component and each of these groups has been meeting separately. Terry asked for a more complete definition (from #3c) of “effective learning environments.” Is this a physical space or broader? A discussion ensued. Classrooms and learning support centers are included here; anyplace where learning takes place. Therefore Angel is a virtual learning environment. Core component “b” is more teaching rather than learning. Teaching transfers into learning through our academic assessment reports. Are our outcomes evident in the assessment reports? Randy added that core component “a” is our assessment process and “c” is the proof that it works! In 2002, assessment of general education was more situated in criterion #3, but “curriculum” is in #4. It’s possible we may ask Mary Breslin for a clarification on this. For “3a” we can go all the way back to 2002, when we were required to
have plans in place, and tell the “assessment story” to present. How has assessment become part of our culture at Parkland?

IV. Criterion #4, under Kim Mills’ leadership, has also divided into four sub-groups, with each meeting twice. One even met online. There have had a session on “scholarship.” Kim asked for a clarification on “co-curricular activities.” Amy said there was a good argument in the Accreditation Handbook (which is in the portal in the self-study team site) on why there is so much overlap in the criteria. The Higher Learning Commission wants us to look at some of the same structures with different lenses and to put a different spin on the analyses. Kim also asked when the writing could commence. Amy said that we would gather data in the spring and fall of 2010, analyze the data and make any changes in operations that are deemed appropriate, then re-evaluate. Randy added that institutional snapshots will be taken in the fall of 2010 and again in the fall of 2011.

V. Rita Myles reported that her criterion #5 team has met twice and, in the second meeting, they divided into four sub-groups to look at the core components. Rita said that her people may be a bit ahead of the game as they began listing constituents served by the college. While this information will be needed eventually, they felt they should back up and ask how we know they are our constituents? She has used the Logan College model and has also looked at Paradise Community College. They plan to meet again as a large group before the end of the fall semester to make sure they are all on the same page.

2. Amy began a discussion regarding the self-study web site. What should be on the public site? Currently you must go from the www.parkland.edu site to “About Us” and then to “Accreditation.” It was noted that we need to maintain an “electronic paper trail” even if finalized versions of documents are presented on the public site. The question became one of “usable work space” versus “transparency.” The best work space is still the my.parkland portal, though some faculty are having security issues. Dr. Ramage will check into this. The portal should be used as online collaboration space, where documents can be checked in and out for editing. Drafts should be saved periodically to document the process. Criterion chairs can post agendas and meeting minutes in the portal. Randy also added that WEAVE, when ready to be unveiled, has space for drafting of documents.

Amy previewed the Paradise Community College site (http://www.pvc.maricopa.edu/~selfstudy/index.htm) who participated in a 2005 site visit. All the necessary links are there in the navigation bar.

The Information Management Team will meet soon to discuss best practices for managing information. A form is currently available to the criterion teams to request information. The team will determine what data exists and is readily available (e.g. retention statistics) and what will need to be acquired. We do not want to survey our faculty, staff, and students to death! What needs to be in an all-college survey? Criterion chairs should not develop surveys on their own. It was noted that we’ll be doing CSSEE in the spring, plus the student satisfaction survey and the faculty/staff
climate survey will be returning. Older surveys exist on the IAR page (http://www2.parkland.edu/oire/index.htm) – do any of the criterion teams need to add questions to these documents? We also have several CSSEE survey results from the past, too.

Maybe by the end of the semester, each team can collect a couple of bits of data to evaluate. The worksheet can be used to generate questions and make data requests.

The Steering Committee will meet again next spring, most probably in late January or early February.