SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
April 23, 2009

Attendees: Paul Sarantakos, Kevin Hastings, Jim Hand, Seth Mendelowitz, Rita Myles, Pam Lau, Dr. Seamus Riley, Terry Adcock, Kim Mills, Randy Fletcher, Amy Penne (co-chair), Dave Leake (co-chair)

1. Higher Learning Commission conference highlights
Amy asked those who went to the recent HLC gathering in Chicago to comment on some of the key items they gleaned from the meeting. Ideas included:

- The PEAQ process is changing. No longer will there be site visits potentially every ten years, though Parkland should be grandfathered in for this visit. This will be the last year for this particular accreditation process as we know it. After 2012, we’ll maintain the same or similar criteria though the revised process will involve Parkland submitting a proposal complete with specific goal and objectives and a HLC team will give us feedback up front. Then the team will return after a specified period and evaluate how we did with these goals. Instead of gearing up for a self-study every ten years, the process will be on-going. We should be forward-thinking now and, after this self-study is complete, we’ll leave some structure in place to sustain the effort. Accreditation periods will be either 3, 4, or 7 years.
- Several commented that it was very advantageous it was to hear what others had done to complete their self-studies. Nearly all of the documents in the Resource Room based their document on the criteria and the core components and not on themes.
- We should evaluate, not describe! The expectation is that we should be beyond assessment planning. Assessment should be a part of our culture and there should be evidence that assessment results are being used in the planning and budgetary processes.
- Unlike our last visit, we’ll be moving from a paper to a virtual resource room.
- We need to document how we handle student complaints and incidents handled by Public Safety.
- The 2002 Self-Study, though successful, won’t help us too much for 2012. HLC is looking for evaluation and not narrative. It may be advantageous to consider what evidence is needed to complete the evaluation of a core component before any narrative is written. The narrative should be written around the evidence.
- Criterion #1 (mission & purposes) should pervade all of the other criteria. Everything is linked back to the mission.
- If a campus activity is initiated in response to a need (e.g. the campus master plan), then we need to document how we discovered the need and the processes taken to address this need.

2. Co-chair Amy Penne will take over the role of primary writer for the self-study document. She’ll take the input from the criterion teams and shape the document before sending to the editing committee.
3. **A tentative timeline** for the rest of the year:

- Amy will supply a template for the criterion teams this summer.
- The timeline will be revised to include a few benchmarks for the teams to meet.
- This fall, the criterion teams should plan to prepare for the work ahead by reading several examples of each criterion from other self-studies, plus relevant chapters from our 2002 document. The idea here is to become more comfortable with what we need to do and to not “reinvent the wheel.” What did others use as evidence for each core component?
- Amy, Dave, and Randy will work with Kevin Knott (Institutional Accountability & Research) to prepare for the data that we know we’ll need, such as retention information.
- Amy suggested that the teams schedule a breakfast meeting for Friday of August’s Prep Week. Amy will reserve space in the Center for Excellence.

4. Amy distributed a draft of a memo that the criterion chairs can pass along to their team members. The memo detailed the task at hand and the responsibilities of the teams. Each team was strongly encouraged to appoint a person to take minutes. Our processes must be documented! How did a team decide which evidence was best to support a core component? We won’t be using all of the evidence available.

5. No one on the Steering Committee had been to the “my.parkland” training. The portal will have “team space” set aside for committee work. The architects of the portal have said that we can set-up work space for the criterion teams, we just need to tell them how we want it set-up. Amy and Dave will meet to discuss this soon.

6. Dave asked the criterion chairs to submit names to him as they populate their criterion teams. He will keep the master list of who has been asked, who has accepted and who has declined.