

John A. Logan College

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

Sub-Committee Chairs Meeting

October 26, 2004

Those present for the meeting were as follows: Dr. Julia Schroeder, Dr. Brenda Erickson, Cheryl Bernhardt, Tom Cardwell, Lauralyn Cima, and Judy Vineyard

The committee met on Tuesday, October 26, 2004 at 11:00 a.m. Dr. Julia Schroeder opened the meeting stating that everyone could get their food and the meeting would begin since some of the committee had noon classes. Dr. Schroeder handed out copies of the 1997 North Central Committee report and the next time they come to visit this will be some type of base line to review. Assessment which is referred in the report was in the very beginning stages. The report mentions that we still have a lot of work to do. Dr. Schroeder mentioned we still have a lot of work to do, at least in terms of the instructional area. Dr. Erickson and Dr. Schroeder met with Dr. Peterson and they are going to find someone in the administration area, who also handles assessment. Assessment has to be looked into in terms of Continuing Education, Business and Industry, ABE, GED, so there will be a representative for that area. Dr. Erickson will be collaborating with the person from the administration area to give them some assistance.

Cheryl Bernhardt asked if Criterion Three was in the 1997 report, and Dr. Schroeder mentioned it may not have been called Criterion Three, but there are several comments about assessment. Dr. Erickson mentioned it was Three, but very light. This is the first time they had asked for assessment under the accreditation process. Dr. Erickson asked if the report included the follow-up because we were negative in several areas and assessment was one of them. If the follow-up is not in the report, then Dr. Erickson has the follow-up in her overview. Cheryl Bernhardt asks if the committee would eventually get copies of the complete North Central Report to use as reference. Dr. Schroeder mentioned that the entire report is in Jo Nast's office for review. Jim Harris had asked for a component that had been submitted previously and Dr. Schroeder had Jo Nast send that portion to him. Cheryl Bernhardt mentioned in the past meeting it was discussed that the committee should see the report and begin compiling. Dr. Schroeder mentioned that once you read the comments, for this particular criterion group, we are not going to be replicating what is there, because we were sited for too many things. Dr. Schroeder felt we were too new to the process. It was reasonable what they sited us for in the report. Tom Cardwell mentioned at the time he did not feel that the state knew exactly what they wanted either because it was also new to them. Dr. Schroeder mentioned that Criterion Five is a brand new component, which Phil Minnis is co-chairing and no one really knows what they are seeking.

Dr. Erickson mentioned that she thought it would be a good idea to have a historical document to review and she has the self-study on assessment and she may have the whole self study, if not, anyone can go to Jo Nast and obtain them. Dr. Erickson asked Cheryl Bernhardt to let her know when she would like the information, so Dr. Erickson can put that on her calendar. Cheryl said she would.

Dr. Schroeder said that she and Dr. Erickson have had a chance to meet several times and they are very pleased with the progress that the sub-committee chairs have made. Everyone seems to be right on tasks. Dr. Erickson agreed with how pleased she was with the sub-committee chairs getting their reports to her and Dr. Schroeder.

The sub-committee chairs were asked to give their reports. Tom Cardwell was called to report first. Dr. Erickson asked the group if anyone had suggestions for the charts and what the outcome might look like, what deadlines they might have imposed. Dr. Erickson then called on Tom Cardwell. Tom mentioned he thought the form was alright but had a problem with the form being on word perfect. Tom mentioned the sub-committee had met twice. The first time was a meeting to find out exactly what they were suppose to do and Dr. Erickson was at that meeting. The sub-committee split the eight items and the four committee members took two each. Tom mentioned that some of the items he was familiar with because of the nature of his job. Tom said that they have a problem with two areas. Basically coming up with a definition of what the committee wants and needs for instance, the definition of where they ask for “multiple direct and indirect measures”. They have come up with some sources for that, but he wasn’t sure and Dr. Erickson was going to do some checking. What the committee basically found was there were three possible choices that they were able to find, one was from Middle State Commission on Higher Education and then another one was definition from Illinois Eastern Community College and then use a different one with institutional research, Mabel Hayes. The committee was unsure of which direction to go and ask Dr. Erickson for guidance. The question on “assessment for all “credit and noncredit” certificate programs, it was found that in the Business and Industry that they do not have an evaluation process on learning. What they basically do is grade on a pass/fail system. It is done on a basis of attendance. If they attend all the time, they pass, if they do not, they fail. There is not a process to evaluate what they have learned, that was according to Michelle Hamilton. Dr. Schroeder said that may not be true about all the programs. Tom stated that is what he also thought. Dr. Schroeder mentioned that she had taught through Business and Industry and students had to take a post test at the end of the training. They did not get a certificate, they just got a pass or fail. That is what the companies expected and the students could retake the course twice if they failed. Tom said he had asked Michelle Hamilton about the training in computer programs. Tom said they have had some students test out pre entry certification, but very few. Michelle told Tom that they don’t rate that with anything as far as trying to see if they should be doing what they are suppose to be doing. Dr. Schroeder said, that it was not true when she did training for them and she did not know how they were handling it now. Tom asked Dr. Schroeder which program she taught. Dr. Schroeder responded it was when she was teaching Statistical Process Control. Dr. Erickson mentioned that conflicts with what they heard at their meeting. Dr. Erickson mentioned they do some other training that has valid data.

Tom mentioned that Barry Hancock said that only time a test is given that you could use as an evaluation process was the security guard fire arms test. Those that take the real estate classes, their test is with a state license and other outside agencies. Tom said that in this area, assessment was not being done at this point. Dr. Schroeder felt that in time there will be assessment in that area. Tom also stated that he felt comfortable with the material they had with AAIC, but Eric Pulley has a mountain of information. Dr. Erickson asked if there was anything to offer to the outcome and when to expect report. Tom stated he did not know how far in advance that they committee would need the final information. Tom stated that his sub-committee was basically identifying what they could find and not find. They felt really comfortable with the material from the alternate sources, not just the AAIC, but a lot from Eric Pulley. Dr. Schroeder asked Tom to give copies of the information, and Tom had copies with him. Dr. Erickson asked how long is projected for the entire self-study. Dr. Schroeder stated the complete study has to be submitted in 2006, with site visit in April, 2007. Dr. Erickson asked Tom to go back to his group and we would need the information by Fall 2005. All of the sub-committees need to get their information by Spring, 2005, Summer, 2005, and Fall, 2005. Everyone needs to think about those time lines. The sub-committees will need to submit to the Co-Chairs, Dr. Schroeder and Dr. Erickson by December, 2005. The sub-committees can self-impose their deadlines that they can work towards and get those on the calendar.

Dr. Schroeder asked if there were any potential surveys or records that anyone is compiling of this group. Tom Cardwell responded, no. He said not at this time, his sub-committee was unsure how far they were to go. He said some other groups on campus have been told much different. They have been told to look at it and come up with something of where, they could look. Not, evidently to "go look". Dr. Schroeder stated in terms of what Dr. Erickson and she have given to the sub-committees were suggestions. Tom agreed that it is a very good outline and gives them something to start from and to know that the other sub-committees are all doing the same thing. Tom stated that he has copies of what Eric Pulley is going to use and has put it in a form for this committee to use. Eric Pulley's has information on our college and all the colleges in the state of Illinois regarding retention rates, graduation rates, etc..

Dr. Erickson stated on the How/Help column (of the form given to each sub-committee), if there is AAIC, or Outcomes Matrix mentioned, she is organizing all her minutes from the meetings and they will be available for copies as a resource document by January, 2005.

Cheryl Bernhardt was called on for her report. Cheryl had a handout of her report to the committee. Cheryl met with her sub-committee on October 4. Cheryl was pleased with her sub-committee and stated that they were a very eager group and had sent her reports which she summarized with each of the bulleted items on the handout. She also included the information summarized from the meeting. Cheryl referred to Appendix A & B which she had sent those to Dr. Erickson and Dr. Schroeder previously. Cheryl felt that the material was ready to be forwarded to Eric Pulley. Cheryl mentioned that Appendix B was being handled by Jim Harris and he wanted approval to get started. Cheryl asked

if there were any concerns regarding the approval. There were none. The specific areas of Cheryl's sub-committee were being handled by the following:

1. Cheryl Bernhardt and Jim Harris
2. Michiko Eberle
3. Denise Crews
4. Harris Mosley
5. Michiko Eberle
6. All

Cheryl mentioned that Michiko Eberle had an excellent report in her handout. Denise Crews, Appendix B of the handout, identified policy, contractual language relating to the process for evaluation for teaching for tenured, non-tenured faculty, term faculty and then she also included the criteria for Center for Excellence and outstanding faculty member award which, was discussed in their sub-committee meeting. Dr. Schroeder re-stated that Cheryl was using the Center for Excellence, policy from contract, criteria for the outstanding faculty, and then ask was that the ICCTA award and Cheryl responded that it was the ICCTA and that it is summarized in the report as well. Cheryl said that the first bulleted item has to do with the services to supporting the improved pedagogies which is Appendix C prepared by Harris Mosley. Harris has interviewed Dr. Erickson, Mary Ellen Abell, he did research for examples of evidence. Cheryl took Harry's Appendix C and summarized it into a survey question, which is actually question 5 on Appendix A, which will be submitted to faculty, really for affirmation of Harry's example. On number 5, "openness to innovative practices that enhance learning" which is related to the supporting of professional development, Michiko Eberle covered this item, and her report is Appendix C. Item 6 was a compilation of ideas that all of the committee came up with during the meeting on Oct. 4th which was supporting of keeping abreast of the research on teaching and learning. Some of this is also supported in Appendix C where Michiko mentions the learning resource center, the grants, the equipping of classrooms. We also added some of the information that IT, computer tip of the day, etc. We mentioned, Judy Vineyard and the excellent job that her personnel does in the training and the on-line data bases and research available. On item number 7, the participation in professional organizations, Cheryl Bernhardt mentioned that she is responsible for compiling that information which is included as question number 4 that will be submitted to the faculty to provide evidence of their participation. Question number 4 is in Appendix A.

Dr. Erickson asked Dr. Schroeder, if she approved of the survey that is to be sent. Dr. Schroeder said that it was her impression that there was to be more information added. Cheryl Bernhardt stated that this is what her sub-committee is submitting to Eric Pulley, he requested that we just submit the questions, he will just do one survey to the faculty covering several sub-committee groups, rather than just do one for each sub-committee. These are just questions that will be included as a part of his comprehensive survey. Dr. Erickson stated there are comments she would like to make before it is submitted to Eric Pulley. Cheryl stated for her to forward the comments to her and she will add the comments and forward to Eric Pulley. Dr. Erickson asked about Appendix B, that if these were just going to the department chairs. Dr. Schroeder stated that the only

comment she would suggest would be that it be changed to John A. Logan and just say “department heads”, which would include Mary Ellen Abell, who oversees all the Allied Health area and her title is not a department chair. The wording “department heads” would include the eight department chairs and Mary Ellen Abell. Cheryl Bernhardt so noted. The wording will be corrected and the survey be given out at C & I meeting. Dr. Schroeder stated that the meeting is next Thursday, November 4th. Dr. Schroeder also suggested giving them a time line to follow such as “please return by December 15th”, etc. make it a small window of time. Cheryl so noted.

Lauralyn Cima was called to give her report. She reported unfortunately they are moving very slowly. There are six “goals” under the 3c of the criterion and the sub-committee was divided up.

1. Anita Petersen and Cindy Minor
2. Lauralyn
3. Rebecca Clifford and Carla Haas
4. Lauralyn
5. Cindy Minor and Anita Petersen
6. Carla Haas and Rebecca Clifford

Anita Petersen and Cindy Minor worked on the “improvements in curriculum, pedagogy, instructional resources and student services” they basically found out how the faculty oversees their program and find ways to improve the education they provide. One way to improve programs is through the use of advisory committees and discussing program content, evaluate curriculum offering, and C & I committee. Lauralyn stated there may be some overlaps with Cheryl Bernhardt’s sub-committee and Dr. Erickson agreed. On goal number 2, Lauralyn is doing which relates to the “environment that supports all learners and respects the diversity they bring”, Lauralyn was going to research more programs that support all learners, identifying the college as having the minority transfer center, the student services, the deaf and hard of hearing, the minority mentor program, the minority teacher education association, the international education and how we would further research this is to address the number of students served by these programs and how they are reaching their goals. Dr. Schroeder mentioned that Lauralyn might also want to look into the HECA grant that is directly related. The transfer center is under the HECA as well. Dr. Schroeder mentioned it is called “Grow Your Own” and it supports students who are interested in learning teacher education. Dr. Erickson suggested having data that could qualify and even do something like a ratio on the non-students who are non minority. Lauralyn moved on to item 3 which is the “advising systems focus on student learning including the mastery of skills required for academic success”, Carla Haas and Rebecca Clifford are going to interview and get the information from the director of Adult Business Ed, Kay Fleming and her documentation advisement series. Assessment - Tom Cardwell, Financial Aid - Stacy Holloway, Development and Educational Programming - Denise Crews, Articulation - Dr. Payne, Student Success - Cheryl Thomas, Jane Minton, and Christy McBride. Lauralyn said that her sub-committee discussed really addressing the learning community and how that helps in the

mastery of skills. Number 4, Lauralyn is doing, “student development programs support learning regardless of the location of the student”. Lauralyn stated that online orientation will be next spring, by April, 2005. Dr. Schroeder commented that one thing to include is that we have orientation for online courses already. Tom Bell and Steve McLaughlin will have that information. Lauralyn stated they will be looking at orientation online courses to teach students how to effectively use blackboard and address the online courses, telecourses, and extension centers. There was also discussion of utilizing the data looking into the effectiveness of the online orientation and students utilizing it, Lauralyn asked, do we have the data or do we need to contact Eric Pulley. How many are more successful in completing these courses versus those students that don’t utilize it? Lauralyn said the sub-committee will be contacting the retention committee to obtain information. Cheryl Bernhardt asked have thought been given to including high school students guidance counselors and students that know they will be coming to John A. Logan. Dr. Schroeder mentioned that Lora Hines is doing an orientation now to junior high students to help their study skills and may be doing a group in Carterville at this time. Number 5 is Cindy Minor and Anita Petersen with “new technologies that enhance effective learning environments”, Lauralyn stated that Cindy looked into the specific software, smart classrooms, portable media, wireless, etc. and had documented a lot. Dr. Schroeder asked when Lauralyn would use this. Lauralyn stated she did not have the data right now, but she will be doing documentation. Number 6, with Carla Haas and Rebecca Clifford on the “organization’s systems of quality assurance include regular review...”. They are going to be contacting Eric Pulley of Institutional Research, Jim Harris of C & I, Judy Vineyard of the Library, Tom Bell of LRC, Robin Pauls of IT, Dr. Payne on ISAT, Dr. Erickson on AAIC, Dr. Schroeder on Faculty and Staff Evaluation and the Five Year Plan. Dr. Schroeder mentioned that the recognition visit could be included in there also.

Tom Cardwell asked if the schedules for the upcoming full committee meeting was needed and Barbara Throgmorton said she was collecting them.

Dr. Erickson excused herself for her noon class. She complimented the committee on their excellent work.

Tom Cardwell said he had a couple of questions. First of all on the mission statement, he found three different ones that are current at the present time. Which one are they suppose to be using. He has been using the brochure. College catalogue has a different one. Dr. Schroeder mentioned she had been to different meetings and different departments have their own individual mission statements. For instance the Construction Management Program has their own mission statement. The AAIC is different. The brochure is the broad mission statement.

Judy Vineyard was called to give her report. She stated she is behind because of not being able to meet with her sub-committee as a whole. She stated that they are meeting October 27 as a group. She met them individually, she mentioned that Stephanie is on maternity leave this semester. Michelle Hamilton took number 6 which dealt with “partnerships and innovations that enhance student learning and the strengthen in

teaching effectiveness”. Mike Seagle took the budgeting priorities. Judy stated she was a little concerned how much she should assign the student board trustees representative, Mallory Childers. Judy ask Mallory to do number 4 the “organization supports students, staff and faculty in using technology effectively”, and for her to think as a student and get the student aspect. Dr. Schroeder asked about a survey question on Appendix A that refers to students. Dr. Schroeder emphasized the importance of the sub-committee meeting and gathering their information. Judy stated that they were meeting on Tuesday, Oct. 27th and she would e-mail Dr. Schroeder and Dr. Erickson a more thorough report. Judy mentioned that in the past there was a survey done on the learning lab and library, so they have some surveys that have been done in the time frame. Judy asked for clarification on number 2 “evaluates the use of its learning resources” and 3 “regularly assess the effectiveness” she was having trouble differentiating between what the difference is in the 2nd and 3rd one. Dr. Schroeder responded to assess the effectiveness it is “what works and what does not work”. But when you evaluate the use of its learning resources then, then you find out not only what does work and what doesn’t work you make changes based on what you find. Judy said it is almost like the third one is part of the second one and Dr. Schroeder agreed. The first one “access to the resources” we are looking at things like are they handicap accessible, etc. Dr. Schroeder mentioned we have contracts with most of the organizations that allow our students on site for their clinical, etc. Most students have to pass a background check, have to do that through Illinois State Police. Judy Vineyard mentioned that is what they are looking into and have available on line as well. Judy thought there were other avenues with the online learning with orientation, supporting the faculty in using technology effectively would be part of number 1. Dr. Schroeder asked Judy, if possibly, would Stephanie meet with Judy this semester even though she is on maternity leave. Judy said that Mike Seagle was going back to the plan for the budget priorities and Judy wanted to be sure that going back to 1995 was correct and Dr. Schroeder said, yes. It was discussed how all the sub-committees need to work together so that everyone is not seeking the same information separately. Tom Bell will be getting numbers on the online participants. Dr. Schroeder suggest that could be a question on the survey. Dr. Schroeder mentioned she supports on-line learning for faculty, classes, and seminars. The faculty staff and operational staff development days were discussed as possibility for gathering information. Cheryl Bernhardt offered any information that Michiko Eberle had done in terms of technology and use that information. Also, Harris Mosley mentioned pedagogies in his report. Dr. Schroeder stated that one thing Judy might do with her group, since Judy has had a difficult time in getting them together, is stress the need to focus and a commitment particularly in the spring and fall. Judy mentioned that they had been very willing to do that, but have been involved in plays, and off campus meeting, etc. Judy did state that Mike and Michelle had been very willing and cooperative and she was going to call Stephanie to see if she would come to a meeting.

Dr. Schroeder thanked everyone again and complimented them on the excellent job the sub-chairs were doing.

It was mutually agreed that Tuesday, January 25, 2005 would be the date for the whole Criterion Three committee to meet. Dr. Schroeder mentioned the importance of

obtaining substitute teachers if faculty have an 11:00 a.m. class. Cheryl Bernhardt said she would try to get a substitute for her 11:00 a.m. class.

Lauralyn asked if a meeting of the sub-groups should be done before the group meeting on January 25th. Dr. Schroeder said that once the sub-chairs have given their reports that is all that is needed prior to the January 25th meeting. It was suggested to have meetings about every six weeks to keep everyone on focus.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.