Review Results of All Campus Y7 Accreditation Survey
Survey to gauge campus-wide familiarity with Yr 7 study. Sent out to about 100 people (not adjuncts, only FT faculty/staff and part time staff). Response rate was 60%. Pretty good representation.

Questions:
1. Type of employee broke out fairly equally. Highest tended to be contract staff.
2. Nobody indicated they were unaware of the college’s progress in fulfilling its mission and achieving its strategic goals. Barb is working on a report to the community with data supplied by Mike to inform of status.
3. Describing how position/area/department/program supports HC mission and core themes.
4. Open-ended responses to question 4 were tagged where natural categories seemed to be emerging. Some overlapped.
5. Every program writes plan, requests budget, identifies outcomes. This question gives indication of familiarity, overall less familiar with program level than college level.
6. Open response regarding success in supporting mission and core themes. Maybe lack of understanding or focus how it all works. All kinds of responses rather than concentrated set of responses.
7. Open ended, categorized into subjects. Communicating and collaborating highest (can be hard to document), PD, etc.

Chad will present this info to the campus as a whole on May 9. Also will be having sessions to focus on assessment. Need to ensure using similar terminology to ensure we all mean the same thing. Some isolation is evident. Everyone is doing assessment, but maybe not connecting the dots. Helping people realize what they already doing that is program level assessment and things that might fall under this header.

Changes to Program Assessment Plans
Had a couple changes to program assessment plans to address gaps in:
1. Continuous improvement – Now requesting “planned improvements” along with documenting activity.
2. Community engagement – Added community engagement section to document how programs are working with the community. Asking for list of collaborations/partnerships during the year, both description and number.
Asks how many hours, actually engaging or include hours to prepare? Mike was thinking total, both inside and out, and will make that distinction.

**New Program Review and Mid-cycle Progress Report schedules**

Have come to end of program review schedule. Chad and Mike mapped out next five-year schedule, tweaked to clean up programs that aren’t around, added new ones, moved a few around. Mix of academic and nonacademic every year, will get published, and out there so people to know what they need to do. Summer will send to UM to submit to OCHE. Every year programs write plans, do comprehensive review, and mid-cycle reporting. Barb Y piloted for Accounting & Business, generally happy with result and prompted some good conversation. Discussed updating parts. Contact with employers and advisory council a bit spotty. Need to connect that piece to individual courses to ensure that info shows changes/modifications as needed. Maybe run a DACUM with advisory council and document results, train faculty to do modified DACUM to embed in part of conversation so they can extract what needs to be done. Could help if narrow the focus. Would need a facilitator (division chair). Need a good mechanism for bringing employer feedback in to plan and assess. SPA will be detecting patterns as well.

**Next Steps in Y7 Self-Study**

Mike posted timeline on accreditation page, last item on sidebar. Chad and Mike will be writing this summer to dig into primary standards. Mike will be collecting data at end of fiscal year. Will bring some issues to fall convocation, followup from spring meeting on 5/9. Hope to have final draft in mid-November, out for publication, out to campus, have another all-campus meeting in beginning of spring semester, then report to NWCCU in February, then evaluators here in April. Best plans are succinct with all the data, answering questions, not reviewing standards. Show evidence.