

SACS Compliance Certification Team Leaders Meeting Minutes

Date: September 13, 2010

Place: MM 135

Time: 3pm – 4:10pm

Chair: Dr. Laura Stafford

Team Leader Attendees: Gary Stretcher, Shannon Harris, Nancy Cammack, Janis Hutchins, Charles Gongre, Linda McGee, Carol Barbay, Peter Kaatrude, Ed Quist, Tom Neal, Claire Thomason, Diane Granger, David Sorrells

Others:

Opening Remarks: Dr. Stafford (5 minutes)

First order of business suspended Roberts Rule.

Thanked all for attending promptly and explained goals for meeting and the handouts.

Goals for meeting:

1. To distribute the SACS Timeline

2. Introduce information about Compliance Assist:

Cammack gave a brief explanation of the software we will use to write and submit the Compliance Certification Audit. The advantage to this product is that it will allow us to develop a document repository to access evidence of our compliance and it will be an efficient means to write the narrative for each section. The training for this software will occur in two sessions and it is hoped that it will begin in early October.

3. Receive initial reports from team leaders as to what major items may be needed to complete the compliance study

4. Discuss which additional resource people will be needed on individual teams

Team Leader Reports of Initial Analysis of Section Six: (3 minutes each)

Governance/Administration:(Stretcher/Harris): Stretcher reported for the committee that they had two meetings to discuss analysis and determined that their section would be divided with Harris focusing on the Foundation and Stretcher focusing on the System, Governance, and Athletics. Harris concurred.

Institutional Effectiveness: (Cammack): Cammack reported that her work over the summer for the 5th year interim report has significantly helped in the initial analysis of her section. The Planning and Assessment Committee is the primary campus committee which will provide information for her part of the report.

Educational Programs Part I: (Gongre): Gongre reported that in 3.4.1 the faculty must be involved in the process of evaluating the curriculum and recommended the campus Curriculum Committee be the entity that will provide information for this standard. He pointed out that the Texas State Coordinating Board is the primary guide to curriculum in Texas. In 3.4.4 he brought up the concern about HEH courses that provide the vehicle for our online nursing classes and some general education classes. This team will investigate the control issue with HEH. He reported that 3.4.7 would be investigating consortia agreements, HEH, and articulation agreements that exist. He concluded with a question of if the college's Mission

Statement would be altered it needed to be done soon since much of his section had to tie into the Mission Statement.

Educational Programs Part II: (Hutchins): Hutchins reported having met twice and drafted a report of her analysis of her section pertaining to the general education 30 hour requirement. She requested a subcommittee with representation from the different components of the general ed. areas. Her primary concern is the language in the standards which focuses on the “rational” for general ed. and the “choose a coherent rational” for the curriculum and the mission that appears in several standards. She stated that there is a chart that needs to be developed about gen. ed. competencies and assessment. One of her standards does require the Mission Statement to be included in the “rational” and there is a focus in 3.5.4 on the sequencing of courses which we do with second year courses being more complex than first year. Technical course have that very clearly shown in state guidelines but she wants input from the academic side to confirm this practice. Cammack added that the WEAVE program we are using for assessment evaluation will help in this area.

Faculty: (McGee/Barbay): Barbay reported that the co-chairs had met once to divide up the labor, analyze definitions, and try to find locations of documents. Pointed out there are several locations for the Faculty Handbook and Part-Time Faculty Handbook online on the campus site and then in hardcopy. She expressed a need for additional people and reported that the largest project for this team will be the Faculty Roster. She had developed a list of glossary terms which she would like clarification and Cammack suggested that she submit that list to her office. Stafford agreed that this would be a task to which all team leaders could contribute. McGee concurred.

Library and Other Learning Resources: (Katrude/Quist) Quist asked to get a copy of the CC Team Leader Guide and Stafford assured him he would be getting his copy as soon as possible. Katrude reported that he is pleased to have Ed Quist as a co-chair since they have successfully worked together for the Bar Association reaffirmation. The library also has recently gone through the Board of Nursing review of library services successfully. His primary focus is in quantity and quality of off campus student services. He mentioned prison population and high school co-enrollment students as two of his focus groups. He knows that statewide the library is well connected to share resources and as long as students have their password and ID and Web access they have access to library services. He felt very confident about the services provided on campus and he would like access to information about the evaluation of the library services from off campus students. It was discussed that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has resources to share with him about that type of survey information.

Student Affairs and Services: (Neal/Thomason): Neal introduced Claire Thomason who will be assisting him with the Student Satisfaction Survey collection, the disciplinary/grievance system, and student life-organizations. He is looking forward to the Banner system giving students more on-line resources particularly with financial aid issues and registration. He is addressing the issues of updating student handbook, the Catalog, and the graduation survey which must be redesigned because the company will only support the surveys we currently have. In his analysis of his section of the compliance certification he knows that all advertizing and printed material must be examined carefully and through discussion it was noted that the Catalog of 2011-2012 will be the official snapshot for the narratives. He pointed out that in the room we were meeting in the campus Mission Statement is prominently displayed and any revisions needed to be forwarded to his office once approved to facilitate campus wide redistribution. He also is aware that the audit is concerned about the delivery of student services to those involved in distance education.

Financial and Physical Resources: (Granger): Granger reported that she has parsed her section and that the standard financial reports of the campus will be needed but she is not sure where they are located and how to have access to them. Her initial concerns with wording include how we define “new programs” and how we (LSCPA) maintain the “off site safety” particularly at the high school where we do conduct some classes as well as the prisons. She too needs survey of satisfaction levels with input from the faculty and staff.

Editorial Committee: (Stafford): Stafford reported that the writing guide will be completed once more information is gathered about what will be useful in working on the Compliance Assist site.

QEP Report: (Sorrells): Sorrells reported that meetings have occurred to divide the aspects of the QEP. He reminded us that QEP is to build on what we do to improve student learning across the campus by evaluating, assessing, and producing a project. It is divided into 3 parts including Planning, which entails input campus and community wide as to what ideas to pursue; Assessment, both internal and external research which research what our campus is currently doing and what other campuses are doing; and then developing the Plan which will be implemented on campus and evaluated every year. He did point out that part of this is concerned with Faculty Development occurring every semester and that possibly a Faculty Development committee should be activated.

Selection of Additional Team Members/Resource People:

The remainder of the meeting time was spent in each team requesting either additional team members or resource people to assist in the collection of evidence for their section. The result of the additional team member selection appears on the separate handout.

Other Business

- Old: Stafford showed pictures of the SACS Institute in Tampa which was attended by Cammack, Sorrells, and Stafford.
- New: Stafford indicated that an email would be sent to team leaders as to the specific tasks their teams would be required to complete by next meeting.
- Announcements: The next meeting would be Sept. 27th at 3pm in MM 135.

Review of Actions from Meeting: Thanked members for their reports and assured them that additional team members would be considered this week and notified by letter as quickly as possible.

Adjourned: 4:10