

**CRITERION 3 MEETING –  
Sub-Committee Chair Meeting  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2005**

Those present were: Dr. Julia Schroeder, Dr. Brenda Erickson, Mabel Hayes, Tom Cardwell, Cheryl Bernhardt, Judy Vineyard

Each sub-committee chair distributed to the committee a copy of their sub-committee report. Cheryl Bernhart opened with reporting on Criterion 3b. Cheryl stated there were issues from her committee. Cheryl went by the list of evidence, example one stated “qualified faculty determine curricular content and strategies for instruction”. Jim Harris wrote he wanted to address it separately, similar to the example, which was given to the sub-committee to use as a guide. Cheryl said the committee wanted to be consistent with the way the report was numbered, so it was broken down to 1A and 1B and asked if that was ok. Dr. Schroeder responded there would be no problem in doing so. Dr. Erickson agreed. Cheryl further explained that one addresses curricular content and the other addresses instruction. Cheryl said Dr. Schroeder had forwarded from personnel the faculty degrees based on last year that faculty hold. It was mentioned from the last meeting that many faculty chose not to answer the degree question on the survey. Cheryl said when Jim Harris looked at the sample from Illinois Eastern to use a guide, he did not see any where in their example of evidence where they even cited the individual degrees of the faculty members, therefore you will note Jim did not include that either. Dr. Schroeder stated that this was only to get the information to see whether or not they had the appropriate degrees. Jim made reference to qualifications through determining curricular content. Dr. Schroeder asked which one. Cheryl then said Examples 1a and 1b. Dr. Schroeder asked if he incorporated it into those earlier ones which were broken apart. Cheryl said, yes. Dr. Erickson said she thought he did not. Dr. Schroeder explained he incorporated into language which talks about it, but he did not put into specifics. Cheryl said yes, he did not break down the quantity of faculty having PhD’s, etc. Jim Harris wanted Cheryl to bring that forward to the committee. Dr. Erickson said she would like to hear the discussion from this group and especially from Cheryl if her committee members had any thoughts on including such a list or not. Cheryl responded the only discussion relative to that was when they started the survey, which was included as a component of the survey, so there was discussion whether to include that for the faculty members. Cheryl mentioned she forwarded the information that Dr. Schroeder had forwarded to her, and Jim said he didn’t think according to the guide, it would be necessary to include the information. Dr. Schroeder stated she thought the information would be something to be archived. Dr. Schroeder asked Mabel Hayes what her thoughts were on the matter and Mabel agreed. Dr. Schroeder stated it would be our support. Mabel stated it would even be in the appendix of the document, but she felt it should be available. Cheryl mentioned Jim’s rationale was he had cited the Administrative Procedure and it implied that the hiring practices of the College and in the Administrative Procedure 502 it states that we are going to have qualified faculty because they will have gone through the Administrative Procedure hiring process. Dr. Erickson said she almost

takes another position. She addressed Tom and Judy as to whether they had thoughts on the matter. Tom stated he did not know which way to go on the issue. Judy agreed with Tom. Dr. Erickson stated she would like to table it. She doesn't know if it needs to be included in the document, but the question was asked on the survey. Possibly a summary of what are the academic credentials. A summary stating that there are so many Associate Degrees, etc. Dr. Schroeder stated there will be a summary of the survey that will indicate the degrees. Dr. Erickson then asked "do we simply refer to that section of the summary of the survey then?" Dr. Schroeder then stated not sure how valid it would be. Dr. Erickson said when the committee last met, wasn't it stated there would be another survey. Dr. Schroeder said yes. Dr. Erickson stated she thought it does lend itself to determining the quality of our faculty. She felt there was a relationship there. Whether it is made a part of the document or a separate document that is to be referred to, she thought it ought to be captured. Tom Cardwell ask if the faculty members themselves are being asked if they are qualified. Dr. Erickson said, no, we are asking them to identify their degrees. Dr. Schroeder said if we do that it should be in the form of the dialogue, might say so many of our faculty have a masters or higher in a certain discipline, like a percentage. Discussion followed. Cheryl Bernhardt stated she would report back to her committee, further surveys will be conducted to caption the information and how to address it. Dr. Schroeder stated mabe just say further information may be compiled. Because in particular to degrees, that is something that could be addressed to personnel, to ask them to give an updated list for this year. Dr. Erickson mentioned that would be another way to get the information instead of a survey. Dr. Erickson asked how many new full time faculty hired since last year? Dr. Schroeder answered, five faculty have been hired. Dr. Erickson stated she is going to keep a list of things she wants to address in the Co-Chair meeting on October 3<sup>rd</sup>. She asked if she should bring up the idea of the second survey? Dr. Schroeder responded, maybe bring up the idea of what should be re-surveyed. Dr. Schroeder stated that everyone must realize a lot of people are agitated at the present time. She stated people are being hit with a lot of things right now in addition to all the other obligations concerning them, including herself. Dr. Schroeder said she had been asked for information from another criterion group needing a response to nineteen items. She felt there are other means of getting information instead of another survey in certain instances. Dr. Erickson asked Cheryl if she was going to be responsible for making notes to Jim, that it might be something down the road. Cheryl stated she was planning on meeting with her committee this week to show them what she has collectively from these meetings. She mentioned she would let Dr. Schroeder and Dr. Erickson know the date and they are invited to the meeting.

Cheryl mentioned the next question had come from Denise Crews, she dealt with evaluating teaching and recognizing effective teaching. Denise had concern whenever she had done initial research for the committee, she was very extensive and absolute. Cheryl mentioned in the previous progress report it reflects that. Cheryl felt Denise did an excellent job summarizing and shortening the report. Denise just wanted to be sure what she had submitted was alright. Cheryl felt Denise covered, Appendix B, with a more specific reference of the Board Policy. Cheryl asked for response on this and Dr. Schroeder and Dr. Erickson both said they needed more time to review. Cheryl will note to Denise.

Cheryl stated she had already mentioned about Michiko Eberle's situation with having two components. Cheryl actually did example 2. Cheryl said she cited some of the previous research on faculty contractual agreement, faculty staff development day, there are a lot of other things that had been mentioned as examples of professional development opportunities, which were mentioned in examples 4, 5, and 6. Cheryl mentioned when Illinois Eastern did their report, they would cite "see example", so and so. Dr. Schroeder stated had Michiko not done one of the assignments, she would be upset, but Michiko had completed one and then ran out of time. Dr. Schroeder felt Michiko needed an apology from the committee, because the intent was not to give her more than other people. She further stated people should let the committee know, if they need more time, etc. Dr. Schroeder mentioned she did not want so much negative to occur when gathering the information, by the time the visitation arrives, there will be "a kettle boiling". Cheryl stated she would relay the apology.

Cheryl said concerning the last section she had, she noticed Steve O'Keefe sent around a survey and the subject line said "North Central" asking for professional organizations people belonged to, Cheryl didn't know if that information would also be the same information we could use in Example 7. Dr. Schroeder said she had spoken with Steve and he is collecting the information for his sub-committee and he will give her the chart of the information. Dr. Schroeder stated it would be another item that would not have to be done in a survey, if it is comprehensive enough. Dr. Erickson said on the faculty survey, it was expanded on participation, we further defined participation, we wanted to know if they did a journal, paid dues, etc. Dr. Schroeder stated caution has to be taken, because she had information the other committee members did not know. A member of the faculty blasted Steve O'Keefe by e-mail to Steve, stating "didn't they already provide this information", etc. Dr. Schroeder said she was copied on the response to Steve O'Keefe. Dr. Schroeder stated she did not want what this committee is trying to do create so much resistance, that we will get less of a response. Maybe the department chairs could gather the information. Discussion followed. Tom Cardwell said the most common complaint he has heard about the whole process is people are being bombarded with the same question by many different sources. There will be a lot of repetition in the document. Mabel Hayes will be the one to put all the report into one document.

Cheryl said to notice how Illinois Eastern addressed the question on page 114, in one paragraph, six lines. They just simply stated, many faculty belong to professional organizations related to their discipline and then they cite Appendix F. Cheryl broadened it by citing our faculty agreement with the College and professional and development funds available. Then Cheryl states there will be an appendix later showing survey results. Cheryl discussed this with Eric Pulley. Dr. Schroeder stated based on the information from the survey, maybe it will be surveyed in a way that better information will be received. She stated everyone has to be careful what is put in an appendix. Proof must be shown for what is stated. Or it needs to be stated we do not believe this is representative for whatever reason. Mabel stated this document has to show evidence. Dr. Schroeder brought to the attention of the committee the paranoia continues. Concerning the non-teaching and professional survey, many people have said to her that

“there is no way I could answer this questions because if, I did after a while they might figure out who it was” Also, an operational staff person had a question on assessment, and had the wrong interpretation. Discussion followed. Dr. Schroeder mentioned someone from operational said they crossed out the questions, they didn’t answer, it didn’t apply to them. She said there are problems in getting the surveys.

Cheryl said she just wanted to alert the committee, it states there will be an appendix, obviously there won’t be one, but hopefully there will be one later. Dr. Schroeder mentioned to Mabel concerning the faculty survey, if we do a composite of the faculty survey we just completed, composite the results and use that as an appendix, it would not accurately represent our faculty. We have got to state that, if we are going to use the survey. Mabel stated that appendix may not come from that survey, the appendix may come from other information gathered from other groups as opposed to the information off of the survey. Mabel stated it might be from the personnel office. Cheryl Bernhardt said she did not know what response Steve O’Keefe was getting, but his asked specifically for professional organizations. Dr. Schroeder stated that is a good question to ask the group and told Dr. Erickson that might be a good question to ask in terms of co-chairs. When another group is gathering similar information such as Steve O’Keefe, if we all knew that, we might have been able to insert the other statement to what degree do you participate. Dr. Schroeder said she knows people are getting tired of being asked the same question by the different criterions. Cheryl Bernhardt then asked if she should wait on the survey. Dr. Schroeder felt Cheryl should make a note we know Steve sent out the question. Steve may not get a very good response, so that will become another issue. Cheryl agreed. Cheryl stated those were the questions from her committee and she will go back to her committee and discuss more. Dr. Erickson thanked Cheryl for her report.

The co-chairs, then asked Tom Cardwell, to report on 3A.

Tom Cardwell stated it was relatively straight forward because of the work Dr. Erickson has done with the assessment implementation committee. Tom stated he tried to condense the information as much as he could. His only concern was with the statement made about most non-credit participant programs do not have assessment learning, which they do not as far as we know. Tom further stated he spoke with Sheila Colombo and was not aware she was doing the part on Adult Ed. He stated his committee had basically made the statement “at this time most non-credit participant programs do not have assessment of learning”, which they don’t as far as what is known. Tom said he talked to Sheila Colombo after the meeting about how to do that with Business and Industry, she didn’t have much from Barry Hancock on Adult Ed. If we don’t have that information we will have to probably put it in the report and say what? It may be said assessment is difficult on Adult Ed class, it is not graded, no assessing of dancing skills, etc. Sheila is setting up some way to obtain the information. In the Business and Industry area, they do not do written assessment, their type of assessment of whether or not they are doing the job is whether or not they sign a contract with a company. Tom felt more could be added to his report if needed. Tom thought the draft on the names could be removed, but he thought probably it could be used and referred to it as an appendix and go to your

document rather than have that page in there to shorten. Dr. Erickson felt Tom's group had answered the questions and provided the evidence and now she will go over the material and update. Dr. Erickson thanked Tom for his report.

Mabel Hayes was called on to present report on 3C

Mabel stated she had not had a chance to look at the report. Dr. Erickson reported she wanted to review it also. Dr. Erickson did mention in Example 1, more was being done. Example 2 on Diversity one of the patterns we are looking for is the role advising plays in instructional services. Dr. Erickson stated this is the service they provide in terms of advisement, but she felt it should be looked into deeper in terms of the learning process from advisement. What we do in the classroom with advisement. Dr. Erickson asked for input from the group. Mabel Hayes said there could be a weakness in there because there was only one faculty member on that committee. Mabel stated there were two people on the committee that "had no clue" about academics. Dr. Erickson said that Carla Haas and Rebecca Clifford were on the committee and should there be someone from advisement help with this. Discussion was held. Dr. Schroeder mentioned she had spoke with the President and Vice Presidents on this date about her concerns about assessment in general. Dr. Schroeder stated she is very concerned, because she knows that assessment is going on in the administrative area, she is uncertain if it was continual. She mentioned to the Vice President's what was needed in the area of student services, Dr. Peterson had agreed to giving names who are actual advisors. Tom Cardwell is already on the academic assessment implementation committee. She mentioned we have the student services component and we need someone on that committee that is actually an advisor. Not a faculty advisor but someone who works out of the admission. Dr. Schroeder said she had been sending Terry Crain questions to check the "pulse" of what she thought might be occurring. They have done some minimal surveys. Dr. Schroeder stated she mentioned to Dr. Peterson she felt that was good. She further stated the problem when doing a survey, there is never a similar survey or a follow-up survey to make a judgment. They do a survey and say they have done some adjustments from it, but it has to be continual. Dr. Schroeder explained to Dr. Peterson the concerns about the surveys. Dr. Erickson stated she did see close in line what she believed the Higher Ed Commission will be looking for. The intrusive advisement that Cheryl Thomas and Jane Minton did, she felt was so closely related to what has been going on in the classroom. Dr. Erickson stated she did not know if she saw that in this report. She then asked Mabel her thoughts. Mabel agreed it was probably not. Dr. Erickson brought forth some more questions to Mabel such as, how is this done in the classroom. Dr. Erickson gave Mabel examples and suggested talking to Cheryl and Jane for assistance. Mabel mentioned in Example 4 they refer to the location of the student. The committee did not come close to the correct meaning. They took it to mean the location of the student on the career track, high academic, etc. Mabel said she took that approach and she thought it was where does the learning occur. Discussion followed. Dr. Schroeder took the location of the student to mean the learning location, in terms of progress. Mabel stated that was the slant that she took. More discussion followed reading the question. Dr. Erickson asked if the whole group had the question or just Rebecca Clifford and Carla Haas, Mabel stated Rebecca and Carla had the question and Dr. Erickson felt she had some information she

could lend to the subject. Dr. Erickson told Mabel to tell them to contact her and Mabel said she would. Cheryl Bernhardt brought to Mabel's attention that there were some similarities in her group's example 5 and Mabel's example 5. Cheryl said there were similar references and that Michiko had worked on that one. Mabel stated when the final copy is drafted the College will have had Title III for a year, so there should be things that can be cited in that example that are current.

Judy Vineyard gave her report on 3d

Judy stated once her group got the example from Illinois Eastern, it helped get them on track. They came up with lists of resources and made assignments to everyone. Judy stated she wasn't sure how this committee wanted them to do it, but in the example that is how it was done for the library and the learning resource area. Dr. Erickson complimented Judy on the amount of data she had gathered. Judy asked for feedback on the format. Discussion followed. Dr. Erickson stated she would need more time to go over the report. Judy stated she had some problems with Example 2 and 3. Example 2 is the organization of evaluation resources and Example 3 is assessing effectiveness of planning. One is evaluating and one is assessing. Judy noticed that when she would ask people, she didn't get clear information, they would just answer one of the examples. They felt the questions were the same. Judy said from Illinois Eastern's it seemed like on Example 2 it appeared they gave areas where they collected the information. Then on Example 3 they talked about the plans. Judy asked for more clarification. Dr. Erickson suggested she look at Paradise Valley report, she thought it might help answer Judy's questions. Dr. Erickson suggested she and Dr. Schroeder review what Judy had reported. Dr. Schroeder said there is a meeting on October 3, with the co-chairs and she wanted to be sure that Judy didn't do any unnecessary work. Discussion followed about the resources on the report. Judy mentioned number 7 on the budgeting, Stephanie Chaney Hartford felt it should be the college wide budget, not the individual areas. Dr. Schroeder she had seen the budget in a presentation and knew that J. P. Barrington would have possibly given it to her. Judy felt a broad statement would fit that example. Dr. Schroeder suggested that Judy call Stacy Buckingham. Judy complimented her committee. Dr. Erickson asked how the student representative, Shana Woodworth, was doing on the committee. Judy stated she did not want to give her too much, and she was not clear on how much to really give to Shana. Judy felt that Shana had felt somewhat overwhelmed and did not want to give her too much.

Dr. Schroeder commented all the sub-committee chairs had all surpassed what she thought would be accomplished. Dr. Erickson agreed. Dr. Schroeder said she felt the next step would be after the meeting of the co-chairs on October 3<sup>rd</sup>. Dr. Schroeder said she had no assignments for this next week. Dr. Schroeder mentioned to the chairs to please keep them informed when they encounter frustrations. Dr. Schroeder commented about not infringing on people's time. Judy stated that everyone she had contacted had been very cooperative.

Dr. Erickson thanked everyone. The meeting closed at 12:00 noon.