**Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting Notes**

Monday, November 28, 2016, 3:30 – 4:30 pm, Room M226

*No David Plotkin, David Mount, Cynthia Risan; Bill Calabrese attended*

*Bill Waters & Sue Goff led the meeting*

**Survey Results**

BJ reviewed the attached summary of survey results, and provided a link to the full results. Bill recommends that the committee use the link and read all of the comments as the information will help inform our discussions.

Discussion:

* Calculation of a 6-year graduation rate from 4-year schools includes when they started at CCC, not when they graduated.
* Special note made of the following objectives and indicators:
	+ General comments:
		- In CTE, make reference to high demand, high wage career opportunities
		- When we use words like successful or region we should define them
	+ Academic Transfer:
		- Transfer rates for cohorts to higher level degree at another 2-year school
		- Leave room for earning “extra” credits but be mindful of wasted/excess credits from poor advising or agreements
		- First choice school
		- Number of awards given is not a strong mission fulfillment indicator
	+ Career & Technical Education:
		- Number of occupational skills training certificates based on area business needs assessment
		- Are graduates successful upon job entry, do they move up after they have been working for a while?
		- Programs reflect regional workforce needs – occupations and occupational skills, perhaps more specifically on high demand, high wage jobs
	+ Essential Skills:
		- High school students who test out of remedial WR/MTH come college ready
		- Completion of AHSD within a year
		- GED/ESL – the data we have is irrelevant as the number of testers we show are not necessarily enrolled in our program, they just happened to take the test here. It is difficult to tease out this information, and we need to understand if this would be meaningful to use even if we went through the trouble of getting it (will it be used to drive what we are doing?). External and accountability and best practices need to be looked at, as well as rate of GED/ESL students to employment. Identifying an ESL student’s intent would also be helpful. Bill advised everyone to be
		- thoughtful and careful of setting up language that could cannot be clearly measured and assessed
	+ Lifelong Learning:
		- The language feels very loose and unfocused. Partnerships feel like outliers. This area feels like it needs the most work
		- Need to define/reword “community agencies”, clarify the language “and develop strong partnerships with our community agencies”.

Bill would like a small sub-committee to meet this week to begin work on core theme language, which should include one person from each area if possible (Bill, Donna, Sue G, Sunny all volunteered).

***Next meeting: Monday, 12/5, from 3-5pm in M226***

***Presidents’ Council: Tuesday, 12/6, present 1st read of core theme language changes***