**Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting Notes**

Monday, January 30, 2017, 3:00 – 4:00 pm, Room M226

**Board Feedback**

The Board suggested one change to the CTE language after first read:

We prepare learners to attain their education and training goals for career development and advancement through programs and services that reflect regional labor market needs, for example the job needs of government, business, and industry.

**Community Engagement**

An accreditation update and survey email will be sent out Tuesday to all staff asking for their feedback on the proposed core theme language changes (the survey will be open until noon on Friday). Christine will bring the results to our next meeting so that we can prepare final language for approval by the board on Wednesday, 2/8.

It was decided that we will host an hour-long community forum at each campus the week of 2/13. This will be to gather feedback on the proposed objectives and indicators for core themes. David would like 2-3 committee members at each event to answer questions (volunteers needed) and we should distribute information ahead of time to give staff time to review, and possibly include another survey for feedback. Christine will schedule dates/times and forward to the committee to ask for volunteers.

**Objectives & Indicators**

*See attached language, objective, and indicator document for additional notes.*

Essential Skills: Tara will send proposed indicator language [worked on with Darlene and BJ] to Christine before the next meeting.

CTE indicator #1 comments:

* If “80%” of CTE students are meeting program outcomes then we are meeting our mission (each program defines what that cut-point is).
* Must aggregate up from program assessment to institutional level (licensure exams, % of students who pass).
* Once we identify the indicators, we need to determine our threshold of mission fulfillment as an institution (need a common scale and benchmarking for each program). If one program doesn’t meet this threshold, does that we mean we have failed as an institution?

Additional Discussion:

* It was noted that if we set internal bars we are only able to measure against ourselves.
* It is not just about student attainment. How many of our programs have robust assessment programs that have a rubric to back them up?
* Must have institutional view into our assessment work. Multidimensional rubric or standardized testing for some programs? We should encourage programs to have an assessment of the assessment. Results should prompt for investigation not for persecution.
* Establish a clear endpoint so we can judge results.
* Do we need to scale down the number of outcomes for a program who have many?

David will look at other institutions to see how they approach their year one reports.

**Next Meeting**: Tuesday, 02.07.17 from 9:00 – 10:00am, M226