

**ACCREDITATION RESPONSE GROUP  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
12:15-1:45 p.m.  
December 15, 2010**

**Present:** Brenda Baity (Faculty Chair, Accreditation), Phil Briggs (Assistant Research Analyst, OIE), Ryan Cornner, (Dean, OIE), Karen Daar (Dean, Academic Affairs and ALO), Ran Gust (Library), Jeffrey Hernandez (Faculty Co-chair, Budget Committee and ESGC), Alex Immerblum (President, Academic Senate and Co-chair, Student Success Committee), Veronica Jaramillo (SLO Coordinator), Sarah Master (Research Analyst, OIE), Richard Moyer (Vice President, Academic Affairs), Oscar Valeriano, (Vice President, Student Services), Steve Wardinski (Chair, Curriculum Committee)

- I. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda:** K. Daar called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. The agenda was approved as presented.
- II. Approval of Minutes: M/S/P (Hernandez/Wardinski) to accept the minutes of October 20, 2010, as published.**
- III. Substantive Change Reports and Role of ARG:** The need for a number of substantive change reports, including for the new South Gate/Firestone site, the Health Sciences Careers Program at the new Corporate Center site, and other distance education courses, has been identified, but at this time there is no clear process for their preparation nor is there identification of the levels of campus approval. Approval of a single course can trigger a need for a sub change report.
  - A.** Timelines and planning for preparation and approval of a report need to be considered carefully to meet the District and ACCJC timelines. Planning must be done ahead of time because the process can take up to a year and maybe 2 years.
  - B.** B. Baity, K. Daar, and R. Cornner will oversee the report preparation. For a distance education sub change report, the distance education coordinator, working with the “experts” most knowledgeable about the content directly related to the identified report, will be responsible for its preparation, working from a template. The report will be forwarded to ARG, the Senate, and ESGC for review and approval before it is sent to the Board of Trustees. ARG will also play a similar role in the preparation of the College’s midterm report, due in March 2010 and the next self study due in 2015.
  - C.** Discussion continued about the substantive change report for distance education courses.
    - 1.** S. Wardinski expressed a major concern about a disconnect within the curriculum process. Due to lack of planning, there is a disconnect in that chairs in the career/technical departments believe that they can write up a distance education course request and have it offered right away. Every December and May he learns that courses have already been scheduled and need immediate curriculum approval.

2. R. Cornner questioned whether we have a process for determining that a new D. E. course will trigger a sub change report? S. Wardinski responded that the Academic Senate recently approved the process. In addition to a department answering this question as a part of the course offering request, the deans are supposed to be watching out for this.
  3. J. Hernandez stated that we haven't had the Senate discussion about a number of questions being raised about distance education on campus. The Senate Executive Committee will be working on a plan that guides this discussion.
  4. K. Daar, referenced the letter of December 8, 2010, from ACCJC regarding the decision of the Committee on Substantive Change to approve seven certificate programs and two Associate degrees for distance education:
    - a. Our report sought approval of 18 degree programs and 7 certificates. She will ask for a revised list to include all of the programs and certificates requested.
    - b. She will also seek clarification of whether the new transfer degrees will create a need for a sub change report.
    - c. In the letter, the Commission expressed "concern about the data we presented in the report that demonstrates a gap between the student success rates of distance education and face-to-face programs/courses as the D.E. program continues to grow." The Commission also questioned "the interactivity of the student support services, such as counseling and tutoring." These issues raise a number of questions that the College must address:
      - i. The need for a clarification from ACCJC about the exact requirements for data. R. Cornner is concerned about the use of the term "program" as it relates to distance education.
      - ii. Whether to establish a D. E. "program" – the pros and cons.
      - iii. The need for more department concern about D. E. courses that have low success rates and the action that should be taken.
      - iv. Development of a firm definition of a D. E. course vs. face-to-face course vs. hybrid course and do a better job of making the distinction to all faculty and all committees and make it clear in the schedule of classes.
      - v. K. Daar noted that in January 2011, ACCJC will review its policies regarding distance education courses and therefore things may change with the next round of reports.
- IV. SLO Commission Recommendation – Discussion:** Two documents, the ACCJC *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes* and a list of the *Accreditation Standards Relating to East's 2012 Accreditation Response Regarding SLOs*, were distributed. Discussion focused on how ARG can assist in the College's efforts to meet the ACCJC's expectation for SLOs – that all colleges will be operating at the "proficiency" level as described in the Rubric by fall 2012. At the proficiency level, (1) Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment must be in place for courses, programs, and degrees. (2) The results of assessment must be used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices. (3) Widespread institutional dialogue

about the results must be occurring. At this time the College is having difficulty reaching this stage.

- A.** V. Jaramillo, SLO coordinator, stated that a January assessment workshop will clarify the assessment process and provide additional guidance.
  - B.** Program level assessment must lead to the link the institutional level assessment. A good example of how this happens can be found in the 97-page document "The Guide for Comprehensive Reporting for Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment of the Community College of Baltimore County." An assessment committee reviews all assessments at Baltimore. Another useful reference is BRIC's "Turning Data into Meaningful Action."
- V. Newsletter:** A template has been developed for the *Accreditation Newsletter*. K. Daar and B. Baity will work on the content.
- VI. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. The next meeting will be held sometime in February. Members will be polled as to their availability and a date will be determined.