

John A. Logan College

**CRITERION THREE COMMITTEE MEETING
The Higher Learning Commission of North Central Association**

April 19, 2004

Those present for the meeting were as follows: Elizabeth Bailey-Smith, Cheryl Barrall, Cheryl Bernhardt, Tom Cardwell, Lauralyn Cima Michiko Eberle, Michelle Hamilton, Barry Hancock, Jim Harris, Johnna Herren, Barbara James, Cindy Minor, Harry Mosley, Darren Pulley, Judy Vineyard, Mallory Childers.

Committee members not present: Rebecca Clifford, Brenda Erickson, Beverly McCabe, Mike Seagle, Greg Walker.

The committee met April 19, 2004 at 3:00 p.m. Dr. Julia Schroeder opened the meeting stating that everyone should have received an agenda and the one page handout that is the summary of Criterion Three. Dr. Schroeder explained that she had spoken with the co-chair of the Criterion Three committee, Brenda Erickson, and Brenda apologized for missing the meeting. Brenda was in Chicago on her way back home. Dr. Schroeder stated that there are four items on the agenda that will be covered today. Dr. Schroeder introduced Jo Nast as giving the overview and she will also speak of the time frame involved.

The meeting was then turned over to Jo Nast. Jo explained that our last North Central Accreditation visit was in April, 1997. Our next scheduled accreditation will be in April, 2007. Jo said that this is the meeting to introduce to those that are new to the process and also to those that have been through the process previously, to the changes in North Central. First of all, we use North Central as an actual accrediting agency. Now it is known as The Higher Learning Commission of North Central Association. Jo said that we will hear it referred to as The Higher Learning Commission of North Central Association. In 1999 – 2000, North Central went through a process of self assessment in looking at accreditation and work acceptance. An alternative accreditation process was established. They decided to offer two routes to accreditation, the PEAQ and AQIP. AQIP is the Academic Quality Improvement Program, this is the alternative to traditional accreditation, and PEAQ, Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality, which is what John A. Logan College is pursuing. We are pursuing the more traditional avenues to accreditation. Jo Nast stated, even the PEAQ process has undergone radical change in the last couple of years. Jo has a lot of information on AQIP for those that are interested. Jo also mentioned that Dr. Deborah Payne has a lot of training experience in AQIP. The co-chairs in Chapter Six also have information on AQIP. The administration has made the decision to pursue PEAQ, Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality. We are still working with five criteria just the same as in 1997. Jo stated that the criteria has changed radically. Criterion Three has probably remained the most stable. Jo mentioned that those of the committee that had reviewed the handout and downloaded the information, that there are criteria for accreditation in Chapter 3.1 which is basically and overview of all the criterion. Jo asked the committee to get acquainted with each of the criterions, because the process demands that there be a lot of work between the committees. There are things that have to be collaborated. Also, she stated in the information in **Chapter 3.2, Exploring the Criteria and the Core Components**, that is the one area of the description of the criterion and the other criteria. The first 3.1 was more or less an overview, with core components as the examples of evidence. Jo mentioned that each Criterion has core components.

Criterion three has four core components. Under those core components are examples of evidence. The examples that are given are an idea of what North Central will be reviewing. Jo stated that this is structured more clearly and coherently than last accreditation, material wise. What was done in the past, we looked at peer institutions self-study to help us along the way. These criteria do not go into effect until January 1, 2005, so the old standby of looking at other institutions as a pathway, will no work. Criterion three is closest to the old criterion three than the other criteria are to their counterpart today. This is a lot like the Lincoln Baldrige self study which is good, this is the kind of evidence and analyzes that we became acquainted with those processes. Looking at **3.3, Exploring the Usefulness of Cross-Cutting Themes as Context for Evaluation**, Jo had been to a meeting in March of the Higher Learning Commission and it was emphasized no successful visit will be made without the team members finding evidence for the four themes that are listed in this criteria. This institution has to show evidence for each of these four themes in the institution, that we are a **future oriented organization, learning focused organization, a connected organization, and a distinctive organization**. Those things are very important to look at and consider as a committee. Another area that needs to be looked at is the **Commission Statement, section 3.4, Commission Statement on Diversity, Commission Statement on Assessment of Student Learning, Commission Statement on General Education**, Jo stated that she will be attending an annual meeting of the North Central Association. Over the next two years, the college will be sending teams to this meeting, which will be a representative of each of the criteria committees, so that we can learn as much as possible. We will be finding ourselves in the next two years in a real steep learning curve. The real work will begin in the fall, the committees will reconvene with the gathering of the information and pull together the conclusions of the report. The time line we are looking at in Fall, 2004, we reconvene and the committee begin the work for their criterion. The committee will have until Fall, 2004, to Spring, 2006, to create that report. This isn't a lot of time considering the work to be done by the committees. The co-chairs receive a document in spring of 2006, then they have until summer or fall to pull everyone's information together to make one document for the institution that is actually sent to the team, who will come and do our accreditation in spring, 2007.

Jo asked Larry Peterson if he wanted to add anything. Larry stated that this is very important and he and Jo will be available to the committees and have available resources. Jo's office has a lot of resources about North Central of what the commission has looked for in the past. There is not a lot of information dealing with the new criterion.

Jo stated there is a pilot project that will occur in the fall we may be able to learn something from the regional meeting. In the spring, a team from Logan will attend a regional meeting. If have questions, Jo Nast stated that she can be reached by e-mail or call her. Each co-chair has a fact form if you want updates on the North Central information, you need to get on their mailing lists or e-mail. Jo has a list in her office.

Dr. Julia Schroeder suggested that Jo have Robin Pauls put the information on the system and that way everyone could print it out. If anyone does not have access to the intranet, they could get the information from Jo Nast office.

Dr. Julia Schroeder stated that in terms of this particular criterion, she felt very comfortable, does not feel there will be many problems. Dr Schroeder stated that this is actually an assessment piece and although it was new to the accreditation process on the last cycle, but we certainly deal with assessment now throughout the instructional area and Tom Cardwell's area assesses students entering the institution.. In

looking at what Dr. Brenda Erickson is dealing with in academic assessment we have specific education goals. The goals are now on there second cycle. There have been nominal groups that have met on all of those. Dr. Schroeder also stated that by the time we actually submit this report, it will have gone through the second cycle. We have learning effectiveness and teaching effectiveness that will not be a problem. She feels very comfortable.

Dr Schroeder passed out to the committee a sign up sheet listing the four components in terms of the criterion on sub-committees that are going to be established. She asked that everyone sign up for one of the sub-committees. On the top line of each sub-committee listed, she asked that if you wanted to be chair of that sub-committee, you sign there. If no one signs as a chair, then a chair will be assigned. She asked if anyone had questions or concerns. She again stated she was confident that we will be able to show that we have evidence of student learning, and teaching effectiveness necessary. Dr Schroeder announced that we do have a new student trustee to the Board of Trustees on the committee, Mallory Childers. Dr. Schroeder then asked the committee to state their name and what area that they work in, so that Mallory would know their name.

Dr. Schroeder announced the committee members that were absent and those that have given reasons they could not attend.

Jo Nast added that we really need to think about collaboration and working with the other committees and keeping communication open between the committees.

Dr. Schroeder stated that there is a steering committee over the entire process that will tie everything together in terms of insuring that all committees are working together.

Dr. Schroeder closed the meeting asking everyone to go over the material provided to the committee and also to check the Intranet.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

NOTE: Anita Petersen Braun replaces Barb James, who is retiring.

| 4/28/04

Formatted: Font: 9 pt