1) Introductions . . . we welcome Pam Lau as our new criterion #2 chair . . . . welcome Seamus Reilly as the new Vice President for Institutional Advancement and Research . . . welcome Randy Fletcher as the new Dean of Academic Services. Mr. Fletcher comes to us from Danville Area Community College where he is heavily involved in their self-study process. DACC expects an on-site accreditation visit in 2009.

2) The committee reviewed some draft job descriptions for each level of involvement with the addition of duties for the Information and Resource Team and the Editing Team. The main concern was who would be doing the writing. The consensus was that the writing would be done at the chapter level, though a suggestion was made to have a writer assigned to each criterion team.

3) Randy Fletcher was asked how DACC handled the beginning of their process. At DACC he requested a detailed table of contents and an outline of chapters before anything else was done. There was one writer per criterion and a team for each of the five criteria. Each criterion team sent a draft to him who checked it for cohesiveness and accuracy and then the draft went to an editing team for a check of mechanics. Terry added that, during the 2002 process, the chapter committees operated independently and never met with the other chapter committees within their criterion.

4) The consensus was that we need to make the criterion team the basic unit in this process and recruit for these teams with the idea that the recruits may become chapter chairs. Clear expectations are needed when recruiting. Amy reminded everyone that we have six semesters to do the work. It must be evaluative, not merely descriptive. Kris added that we need to explain why, discuss connections, alternatives, implications, compare and contrast, “show, don’t just tell.” Mr. Warfel added that HLC is interested in how Parkland processes change. We do this by looking at our past, our present, and how we prepare for our future.

5) It was pointed out that each of our PCA committees should base their end-of-year reports on a reflection of the previous year and use the same language as the Higher Learning Commission.

6) There were two basic issues that were the main topic of discussion: a) Should the criterion committees do the work as a whole or should they be split further into
chapter committees and b) should we create chapters or just use the core components listed in the HLC handbook?

7) After a break, these issues were discussed in five small groups with one criterion chair per group. When the large group reformed we shared main points:

- In the fall and spring, we have five sessions at the Center for each criterion (similar to the Core Values sessions) where each criterion and the core components could be introduced, followed by brainstorming. Chapters could evolve from these discussions with the chapter committees potentially recruited from the participants. This would also involve the rest of the college in the process. Criterion chairs could personally invite those who they think would help their team. The sessions would be facilitated by the specific criterion chair with Amy and Dave doing an introduction.

- Who is the self-study for? Do we write chapters (which would be easier to organize and read) or use the core components as chapters (which would be easier for the visiting accreditation team)? Ideally, we’d like to do both! This may involve having two tables of contents and annotations in the text or in the margins referring to the core components. The Editing Team would have to brainstorm as to how to best do this.

- Instead of a huge narrative, why not focus on “spotlights” and success stories. The document wouldn’t be written as a report but almost like a promo piece with boxes. We would focus on a few things. The first fifteen or so pages could be an executive summary.

- Maybe the core components could be rearranged in a more thematic way?

- If we want to do both (see the bullet #2 above), we could brainstorm new names for the core components and then use those names for the chapter titles.

- We need to get everyone involved in this process, from faculty, staff, and administrators to the board of trustees, our students, and the community as a whole.

- The entire process needs a theme with maybe some “identifiable objects” attached. Dave and Amy are working on the theme.

- Regarding the timeline, it was suggested that we finish a semester early (fall, 2011) to allow for community comment and involvement. We could set up an wiki or interactive blog for the public.

8) The group will meet at least twice this coming fall. Amy and Dave will arrange for the sessions at the Center and announce those during “Welcome Back” week in August.

Dave Leake