

<h1>Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Meeting</h1>	<p style="text-align: right;">September 28, 2011 8:30 a.m. Lib 112</p>	
Meeting called by: Danita McAnally	Type of Meeting: Regular	
Facilitator: Danita McAnally	Transcriber: Sarah Davis	
Attendees: Mark Hanna, Janet Barton, Bob Austin, Danita McAnally, Kristin McDonald-Wiley, Leslie Shelton, Lee Colaw, Joe Wyatt, Melissa Wilson		
Absentees: Kara Larkan-Skinner, Jessica Smith, Steve Chance		
<h2>Minutes</h2>		
Agenda Item:	Approval of Minutes – July 2011 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to Approve: Mark • Second: Leslie • Minutes approved by vote 	Presenter: Bob
Agenda Item:	Program Review Review questions approved by Institutional Effectiveness Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danita: Please take a moment to review the Proposed Changes to the Non-Instructional Program Review form for one last approval. Departments would have to complete the 4th step, but not the full blown Program Review when their Program Accreditation is extensive (such as the accreditation that Nursing goes through for the Associate’s Degree). Most Accreditations are every 5 to 7 years, but that still does not mean that we would know everything about them. In the Continuing Education cases, they do not always have the same extensive accreditation as in the Nursing area. The Non-Instructional review is the only area we are looking at right now, but we will use many of the same questions for the Instructional review. • Bob: This first question— the individuals in the department find this question to be confusing; what does this question mean? The Mission is so broad. • Danita: The question may need some rewrite. (Danita explained the Mission statement of AC.) Second thing on mission: the cabinet has said, the mission is the full context of the Strategic Plan. Success, access, working collaboratively and economic viability in the community – these are the 4 goals – and that is what the Mission states. Program Review is to fall within these ranges. Can we explain this? This is the focus of reaffirmation. • JOE: We are saying we can teach classes in Alaska and it’s okay if it fits in our bottom line? • Danita: No. The teaching has to fit within our mission when it’s taken down to the 4 components. It’s not so broad and not serving everyone in the US. How it fits within the mission is what’s 	Presenter: Danita Action Items: Clarified wording of Section I and A-D of Section II.

important.

- LESLIE: We are trying to make it too hard. State the purpose: ‘How does this department’s purpose work within AC’s purpose?’ There may be a different perspective and explanation from one person in the department to someone outside the department that would require additional details.
- Danita: Did they explain the purpose within the mission?
- Lee: I agree it’s okay as written. I defined my mission within the school’s scope— support the school and students, but not the public. I have a responsibility to CE faculty differently than to the Academic faculty. I understand the question and think we are making it too hard.
- Danita: What about the external review questions?
- Lee: What is the radio YES button?
- Danita: There is a compliance Button and a non-compliance button and then additional questions and room to write in the text box.
- Bob: This (the paper being reviewed) is a two part question and response, one (the first question) for the department and then one (the italicized questions) for the external reviewer.
- Lee: The italicized part is good.
- Bob: Something that would be helpful— “*what does this mean?*” option for a link in case there are those that do not understand. If there is someone in the department that is writing this they may need to click on the link to see examples of what they (the reviewers) are looking for and to understand what is being requested.
- Danita: If we do that it would take a while.
- Melissa: I like that idea. If I had that (examples), then I’d know how much information is being requested.
- Danita: We need to get these questions ready. There are departments that are ready to be reviewed. We do not have anyone available that could make these changes. I can’t change it now.
- Melissa: How about we use one that you like that could be used as an example.
- Danita: Yes, we could, pull some out. What we have right now are links to “Why this question?” that takes them (the person doing the self-study) to a SACS site that states why this questions is being asked. Fix the questions and get them out there and then come back. I can’t afford to wait on releasing the review.
- Janet: Until we get to the link, is this a situation where someone could pick up the phone and call and ask for information so they could complete their writing?
- Danita: Yes and we have good examples. We could be using department examples for each question.
- Mark: We could use the samples if they are really well stated. Examples could be pulled from all different ones (departments), so that various departments could stand as an example for each question.
- Bob: If we had just one example for each question, we would be way ahead in helping them (departments) move along.

- Mark: We could pick one for each area.
- Bob: Another observation—when was the last time reviewed? Take out the word ‘faculty’.
- Lee: Use “Employees”.
- Joe: Can’t it just be support instead of fits within the mission?
- YES (Bob & Lee)
- Bob: Any other questions or comments under Section I?
- Kristin: Under self-study, section C, will those completing the self-study be requested additional information under YES/NO prompts?
- Danita: Yes. There will be a drop-down menu depending on the response.
- Lee: Are we supposed to go straight to the database to complete the form?
- Bob: If you print it out and then you fill it out, you would be filling in information that does not include information that may be prompted by a Radio Button and doing all of the work that is needed.
- Danita: We recommend you create it in Word and then export it into the Database. You can do it directly, but it is not recommend.
- **Danita: Look at Section II.** 2A is 2nd in Importance.
- Bob: If what you are looking for is a narrative description, then we need to include an example as stated previously. Some people had 5 years’ worth of stuff and scanned it in. If that’s not what you want, then there needs to be an example/explanation. What it means to you and what it means to someone else may be two different things.
- Mark: Explain means you have to put in effort into interpreting and not just writing words.
- Bob: True, but the people doing this are not used to reading SACS statements and may not know how to write technically and more detailed; people are hung up on Danita looking at these things. There are many that do not buy into this process.
- Mark: (Suggested change) Identify and explain through a narrative, the improvements/revisions made in the last five years.
- Joe: Provide a narrative that explains...
- Kristin: provide a narrative that explains? I’ll just keep making changes as we’re going along.
- Danita: We have found that putting the copies into the document is better than the links because a link can change. If they did copy a PET Form, then they are writing on this one. We can include “ADD IN THE SELF STUDY QUESTION, INLCUDE A COPY YOUR PET FORM THAT YOU ARE REFERENCING.” We could probably export them to the writer. We will figure this out. Scan if nothing else.
- Kristin: Some are sent to the archives. Now we have the response forms that I will complete and use to revise their pet forms. It is possible that the copy they attach may be different than the final copy since the PET form will go through a revision process.
- Janet: Determine the extent of the Department’s ??? Explain or determine?? Under A. Still not sure of change.

- Joe: Summarize?
- Danita-Yes, use action verbs
- Lee- I don't like extent. Use Summarize.
- Bob: We don't want everyone to use too much time reading, but want to lead to the point of their writing.
- Mark: People don't know the language to use.
- Danita: Go back to PROVIDE a narrative ...
- Bob: How about changing out the words. Instead of identify, use review; instead of determine, use summarize; instead of explain, use describe; instead of 'which resulted from' use 'that are a result of'
- **(Kristin: Went through making these changes)**
- Danita: (Led discussion of length when questioned by Melissa about how much should be written.)
- Melissa: (Reiterated that someone very familiar with testing may need less information than someone not at all familiar with her area)
- Danita: Go back to the instructions. But we have to show concise/critical information in a small amount of space. So C works for Self-study?
- Bob: On D, we should look at the external review question. Change to "Who decides..." instead of broad-base of involvement
- Danita- It focuses on sharing the information and knowing the names and titles of who was involved in the review.
- Bob: gives the writer a way to say there is a process and you're not an independent agent. Ready to look at E and F?
- Danita: We are looking for outcomes and did not say outcomes earlier. This one is about PET forms and what has come out of them...This is about Outcomes, what has changed in behavior/skills/etc. and uses primarily qualitative data. We have also begun to use quantitative information. The next is about Output, as to how many people you serve? This is not necessarily a change in behavior.
- Bob: We may want to take this one, as if someone does not know how to write a narrative. All departments can count and provide a quantitative change. An outcome is more difficult. The question needs to be obvious as to what they need to provide.
- Kristin- on F, is that the only question? If so, it seems pretty straightforward and that all they need to do is provide numbers; whereas, the program review asks for the action plan.
- Bob: If we want the writer to give a plan of action: "Provide a Plan of Action".

(Decision was made to stop at this point)

- Danita: I really need help to quickly get these right.
- Bob, Joe, Leslie, Lee, Janet, and Melissa: (Noted they were willing to return next week.)
- Bob: Questions, should state Give this... needs to be specific. Recommend, finish E & F with those that can come back.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristin: I will try to find a time next week to schedule a follow-up appointment. • Bob: I have an advantage, being mixed with others here, and know what she is asking for, and understand the process, but a lot of people do not understand. Ultimately, we need to support those we are requesting information from. 	
Agenda Item:	Next Meeting: Next week at a time Kristin finds available for members available to attend and complete final edit. (NOTE: No time was available in the week of 10/3-10/7 so a meeting was scheduled for 10/13.	
Adjournment:	9:45 a.m.	