Accreditation Committee - Minutes

February 18, 2016 – 1:30-2:30 – President's Conference Room, W302

Attendees: Terry Byington, Rachelle Malat, April Ake, Grayson Court, Ruby Hayden, George Dalich, Jim Howe, Sarah Ross

Agenda:
1. Mission Fulfillment Matrix:
    a. What is going well?
    b. What is not moving forward?
2. Based on areas not moving forward, liaison sign-ups

Discussion:
- Exciting news – NWC Board accepted LWTech Fall 2015 Ad Hoc report. Recommendation 1 has been met!
- Where we are at: 53% in progress (42 out of 80). 75% is mission fulfillment. It's a good sign – we picked robust indicators
    o Student Achievement is low – this just depends on what indicators we picked. Basic Skills Transition is our best, but we should be working on this (based on the new allocation model, could mean more money)
    o Assessment of global outcomes – this is where we need work. We should be using outcome data to make improvements
- IPEDS helps us compare ourselves to other schools using similar data
- Student perception is good
- Workforce data lags so we do not have that yet.
- Remind Office of Instruction that we are tracking the Advisory Committees
- Employee data is coming soon
    o Increase for security and safety, what was a weakness is now a strength
    o 47% of employees say they feel praised for good work. Cabinet feels 70% is our target; this leaves much room for improvement. It continues to be discussed at Cabinet
- There doesn't seem to be any need for anymore
- Sarah – ongoing conversation within International Programs. We are a prime candidate to go to College Council to make the committee inactive. We've struggled with having people attend. With other changes within International Programs, we feel we're responsive to the accreditation concerns. Feel that we can shed light on these concerns without an advisory committee. Possibly become a quarterly update to college council instead of an advisory committee. Overall, this accreditation committee supports the idea.

Meeting Adjourned

Action Items:	Responsible Party:	Deadline:
Talk to D-Team about tracking advisory committees	**Sarah Ross**	
Add Sarah to College Council agenda to discuss suspending International Programs Advisory Committee	**Terry Byington**	

Accreditation Committee - Minutes

November 2, 2016 – 2-3 PM in E221UCR

Attendees: April Ake, McKelle Hilber, Doug Emory, Monta Frost, Ruby Hayden, Elliot Stern, Rachelle Malat,

Agenda:

1. The road so far
    a. Fall update to campus – edits?
2. The road ahead
    a. Mission fulfillment matrix
    b. Year seven report & visit
3. Substantive and minor changes
    a. Budget request process

Discussion:

- Discussion about the update that will go to campus. This has gone to college council – is this group OK with this update? Yes – no edits
- All recommendations are met with the exception of the International Program recommendation. This is excellent news!
- Mission fulfillment matrix: Our goal is 75%. At last check, we've met just shy of 60% so we are making good progress!
    o Some areas to note:
        ▪ Static in pathways
        ▪ Good progress in student achievement
        ▪ College community area has lofty goals, consider these stretch goals
    o Page 11: looking at whether our programs are in demand in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties. We'd like 95% of our programs to be in demand.
        ▪ We have a lot of degrees that are falling out of demand in two-year degrees.
        ▪ Is 95% too high for us? This is a goal we set ourselves, so we need to consider changing this goal if necessary.
            - If even 1 or 2 programs fall off, we are not hitting target.
            - Consider a rolling average of 3-years
                o **If using a 3-year average, this group supports the 95% goal**. If a program is in decline for 3 years, we need to look closer at this.
    o SAI points is an area we need to pay some attention to this year. Even adjustments for enrollment, we are not meeting targets.
    o Students are saying they are learning their global outcomes – this is positive!
    o Page 20: Recommending changing the target due to the awkward measurement – consider putting a bit of a gap between us and other institutions
        ▪ Purpose is to compare ourselves to other college. The way we are looking at this, we're comparing to ourselves. This recommendation, we would see the gap of "X or less" between ourselves and other schools. This is based on IPEDS data.
        ▪ What does this group think? **This groups supports the recommended change.**
    o Page 26: Sally suggested a change. Add the word "job prep", "capstone", "co-op" to make this more accurate.

- - Concern about faculty assessing students instead of assessment by industry. This should be an outside person checking on us, unbiased.
    - **This group supports this with the note that we look at this later to make sure we are not getting biased outcomes.**
  - o Page 28: This looks at Business & Labor being in compliance with Perkins. We are not meeting target here.
  - o Page 40: employee engagement – partially looking at posting meeting minutes and agendas to Yammer. We are not meeting targets here. This has been taken to College Council and will be brought to cabinet. We are looking to use a Shared Drive instead of Yammer. With this change, we hope to meet targets easily.
  - o Any questions regarding this matrix?
    - Should we be including something for our work in guided pathways? It is more acceptable to add measures rather than delete them. It is reasonable to add this goal even though we do not have historical data.
    - This group would need to decide where to place this within the matrix and then taken to IPEC.
- We may be able to write a 7-year report with less pages going forward (entering links instead of typing)
- We may be asked to nominate people to become evaluators
  - o Elliot, Mike Potter, Doug Emory
- Substantive and minor changes: we have been requested expedited review on most of these
  - o Cost for upcoming changes is going to exceed our budget.
  - o Recommendation that this group should request raising our budget temporarily to 40K for the year to cover these new changes and upcoming changes.
    - Ruby will request on behalf of this committee
    - The document is an internal planning document, not for the general public.

Meeting Adjourned: 2:46 PM

Action Items:	Responsible Party:	Deadline:
Resend the matrix once changes have been made	**Ruby Hayden**	

Accreditation Committee - Minutes

May 22, 2016 – 11-12 PM in PCR

Attendees: Ruby Hayden, Michael Leary, Jim Howe, Grayson Court, April Ake, Doug Emory, Monta Frost, Sally Heilstedt, Jamye Cameron, Ed Montoya

Guests: Amy Goings

Agenda:

1. Dr. Goings' Recent Site Visit Update
2. Tracking Outcomes & Indicators
3. Annual Updates to Our Year 7 Report

Discussion:

- **Dr. Goings' Recent Site Visit**
  - Dr. Goings joins us to share her experience at the Helena College 7-year Site Visit. Amy shares that she is grateful for the work that we do here at LWTech; she believes we are in good shape for our own visit in 2019!
    - One disconnect was not with the community connection, but rather tracking ("writing down") their school activities within the community to show their work.
    - As we get closer to our own self-study, we need to make sure that the school (including students) is up-to-speed on core values and mission
    - Amy recommends a possible sub-committee to handle logistics during our own site visit. Things that may seem small (such as power strips for laptops of visitors) make a big impact.
      - April will start a list for logistics for our own visit
    - Amy anticipates that the lingering recommendation for International will be handled by the time our visit comes around.
  - Ruby will talk with Elliot on getting Kate as our Librarian specialist for the committee. It would be helpful to have this resource to put together the large amount of documentation needed for our visit. Since Kate is in the tenure process, Ruby and Elliot will discuss options to make sure Kate is not given too much committee work.

- **Outcomes & Indicators**
  - We need to look at some of our outcomes that mention specifically SENSE/CCSSE surveys. At Pierce College, they compared their scores to a national benchmark rather than an uptick in their own scores year to year. This may be something that we might want to consider for our own goals. This may be more meaningful to "close the gap" between the national average rather than just our own scores. This group would need to make a formal decision on this.
    - Some concern over looking at external data, since this is something we cannot control. We look at external points for other data (such as employment demand balance and IPEDS national data) so it would be similar to these types of targets

- ▪ **Please reflect on this idea. We will vote on this before the end of Spring quarter** so we can make changes during the Summer quarter. Ruby will send out an email to the group soon.

- **Annual Updates for Year 7 Report**
  - o We discussed in our last meeting writing up the 7-year report this year and updating it annually rather than writing the entire report just before the year 7 visit.
  - o Writing the report now allows for staff turn-over. If someone were to leave the college, the history of work in their particular area would be completed, only needing to add the newest activities.
  - o Cabinet is open to this approach, if that is the decision of this group.
  - o Year 7 report is due Summer 2019. Our visit will be in Fall 2019 (technically 8 years due to being pushed back by NWCCU). We will do a mock visit in Fall 2018 to implement changes in Winter/Spring 2019.
  - o We would begin to write a year 7 report this summer to be used in the mock evaluation next year. This means significant writing to be done this coming summer.
  - o **This group votes to approve writing a 7-year report now and updating on an annual basis.** Ruby will send a signup sheet for areas that need to be written.

- **Annual Report to NWCCU**
  - o Official name changes are needed (for 16/17 year). Also any new programs, any deleted programs, any credit changes, any course content changes over 25%. Sally will compile this and get to Ruby.
  - o Due June 5 (we'd like to submit a bit earlier)

Meeting Adjourned: 11:40 a.m.

Action Items:	Responsible Party:	Deadline:
Send email to committee to vote on changing targets on SENSE and CESSE surveys	**Ruby Hayden**	**Before Summer Quarter**
Create signup sheet for Year 7 Report writing	**Ruby Hayden**	**ASAP**

Accreditation Committee - Minutes

November 6, 2016 – 2-3 in PCR

Attendees: Sally Heilstedt, Jim Howe, Wendy Breiding, Jamye Cameron, Kenneth Young, Rachelle Malat, Barcin Acar, Karen Lee, Grayson Court, Doug Emory, Ruby Hayden, Andrea Westman, Narayani Choudhury, April Ake

Guests: N/A

Agenda:
1. Updates from Fall learning outcomes (Elliot, Suzy, Ruby)
2. Review 2016-17 data
3. Review timeline for writing and sign up for "project managing" sections

Discussion:
- **Introductions & Brief Summary of Accreditation Committee**
  - Welcome new members!
  - This committee is responsible for accreditation of the college as a whole – we do not deal with individual program accreditation
  - We have a 7-year cycle with reviews in years 1, 3, and 7. Our next full scale review is scheduled for Fall 2019 (which is technically 8 years because we were pushed back)
  - This group typically divvies up writing assignments and reviews before submitting the reports

- **Fall Learning Outcomes Update**
  - Elliot, Suzy, and Ruby recently went to a presentation about learning outcomes related to accreditation. A few schools around Washington were given some time to pause accreditation work and work on learning outcomes. Ruby's impression was that none of the schools were doing anything beyond the normal activities around learning outcomes – she can ask Elliot and Suzy to share their thoughts as well
  - They did find, however, that accreditation teams will be looking closely at learning outcomes in future visits, so it is important that we focus on this area for our visit as well. We will need to put methods in place to evaluate our learning outcomes (program level), make improvements to those outcomes, and then evaluate again. We have just enough time before our visit to get this work done
    - Sally reports that work has already begun in mapping program outcomes. Niki Fleetwood is scheduling time with faculty members to map their specific program outcomes – faculty, check your email for a recent message from Niki!

- **Review of 2016-17 Data**
  - When we met in the summer, we discussed changing how we measure success when it comes to the CCSSE and SENSE surveys. In the past, we've set a goal of a 0.1 increase. Ruby shows us the data if we were to change and instead compare our numbers to the national numbers for the same survey. Of these two ways to look at the data, how would this group like to move forward?

- Discussion around only looking at national data – if we see a dip nationally in numbers members may struggle with ethically saying we've done better. Also concern on what 0.1 means to the college – can anyone get behind raising an arbitrary metric by 0.1 points? Folks may respond more to showing improvement overall rather than a small number
      - Similar discussion around tying the successes (better than national numbers OR a 0.1 increase) to an actual intervention we may have tried
      - Discussion around looking at both metrics in order to help the narrative
   - **The decision of this group is to look at both metrics – Any increase from previous numbers AND comparing to the national data we receive from other schools.**
      - Instead of setting a numerical goal (e.g. 0.1-point improvement) we will look for ANY improvement from previous numbers
   - Ruby is waiting on some SAI point data from the state to finish out the 2016-17 data report

- **Timeline for Writing**
   - We have about 9-months to write up our report. There are 5 chapters to write for – the accrediting body is recommending brevity
      - Standard 1 and 2 are already written any may need only slight edits. Standards 3, 4, and 5 have not been edited since 2011(ish) so they will need significant editing
   - How would this group like to divvy up the writing? In the past, we've done one of two ways: a small group from this committee gets together to write a draft then brings it to the larger group for edits OR each section within a chapter is divided up to different people to write and/or reach out to SME and then the larger group meets to edit
   - **The decision of this group is to have a smaller group write a draft, then bring back to the larger group for edits**
      - Ruby, Doug, Grayson, Sally, and Andrea volunteer to be part of the smaller draft group.
   - We will need to meet on a monthly basis rather than the once per quarter we've been doing in order to stay on track with writing and getting feedback. April will send a meeting invite for the 2nd Monday of the month starting in winter quarter. We will also meet once more in December
      - If you're not able to make all the meetings, that is OK. You will still have a chance to provide feedback

Meeting Adjourned: 2:50 p.m.

Action Items:	Responsible Party:	Deadline:
Small group will meet to draft the first portion of items, then bring back to the larger group for feedback	**Ruby, Doug, Grayson, Sally, Andrea**	**Before 1st Monday in Dec.**
April will schedule monthly meetings starting in winter quarter to get this work done	**April**	**ASAP**

Accreditation Committee - Minutes

November 15, 2018 – 1-2 PM in W302E

Attendees: Sally Heilstedt, Katherine Kelley, Andrea Westman, Ruby Hayden, April Ake, Erin Smith, Jim Howe, Xieng Lim, Lisa Meehan

Guests: Crystal McKeag (intern)

Agenda:
1. Mock Visit Details
2. Review of Matrix
3. Work Plan (work back from March 8 deadline)
4. *Accessible records management for evaluators both on and off site (tabled due to time)*

Discussion:
- **Mock Visit**
  - Mark your calendars! Mock visit will be April 19, 2019
  - Our draft self-study should be out by March 8, 2019
  - Tentative agenda for the mock visit below (subject to change) – no feedback from this group
    - Draft Agenda for the day:
      - 9am – 9:30am: Refreshments/Intro w/E-Cab and Accreditation Committee
      - 9:30am – Noon: Meetings with individuals/groups of your choice
      - Noon – 1pm: Open Forum with faculty
      - 1pm – 2pm: Lunch and work time
      - 2pm – 3pm: Open Forum with Staff
      - 3pm – 4pm: Meetings with individuals/groups of your choice
      - 4pm – 5pm: Work time
      - 5pm: Dinner with President, ALO, and select cabinet members
    - Areas of Focus
      - Overall college planning, assessment, and resource alignment
      - Human Resources and Student Services policies
      - Student learning assessment
      - Graduation rates and how we describe/contextualize this data in our written materials
  - Our site visitors will be:
    - Deb Casey (Green River)
    - Kurt Buttleman (Seattle Colleges)
    - Jeff Wagnitz (Highline)

- **Review Mission Fulfillment Matrix - Summary**
  - Some of these indicators may be N/A depending on the years of data (such as SENSE surveys, only done in certain years)
  - We consider reaching 75% of our targets as Mission Fulfillment

- o Some for this year show "Not Available" where we are waiting on the State Board for data and one measure we are finalizing how we track this data
- o Some areas where we might be able to move the needle:
  - ▪ Syllabus lists course outcomes
  - ▪ Catalog shows when courses should be taken for each program
  - ▪ Publically posting committee agendas and minutes (this is also a Perkins requirement)
  - ▪ Employees feeling safe on campus
- o How can we impact these changes?
  - ▪ Leadership team
  - ▪ Accreditation programming at Winter in-service (top 5 things we can work on to see change)
- o Andrea & Jim will look at the Matrix for faculty top 5 areas – Erin and Xieng will look at the Leadership top 5 (we will email this and work to plan for the January 2 in-service)
  - ▪ Due by the end of the week after Thanksgiving
- o Fact or Crap game around Core Theme and Mission (using live polling)
- o Printing more of the mission/pathways cards for IDs (to give to campus members)

- **Work Plan**
  - o Working backwards with March 8 as our deadline, how do we want to move ahead with our review the 7-year study? This is the Accreditation Committee's review, not the full campus (that comes later)
    - ▪ Potentially the same way as last time (checklist-type guide on how to review), but different folks looking at different sections than last time
    - ▪ March 1 is our internal deadline for our review (so Ruby can compile and send)
  - o 5 chapters to review:
    - ▪ November/December: Standards 1 & 2
    - ▪ January: Standards 3 & 4
    - ▪ February: Standard 5 (received the least amount of review in our last round)
  - o Who's Assigned to What?
    - ▪ Standard 1A – Lisa Meehan & Jenny Rogoff
    - ▪ Standard 1B – Erin Smith & Doug Emory
    - ▪ Standard 2A – Jim Howe & Sheila Walton
    - ▪ Standard 2B – Andrea Westman & Cathy Copeland
    - ▪ Standard 2C – Katherine Kelley & Lisa Meehan
    - ▪ Standard 2D – Erin Smith & Jim Howe
    - ▪ Standard 2E – Katherine Kelley & Grayson Court
    - ▪ Standard 2F – Xieng Lim & Sally Heilstedt
    - ▪ Standard 2G – Xieng Lim & Sally Heilstedt
  - o Ruby will send out the assignments as well as how to review and the document to review itself.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:56 p.m.