

SBVC College Council MINUTES February 13, 2013

Glen Kuck, SBVC Interim President, Chair Jeremiah Gilbert, Academic Senate President, Co-Chair Dan Angelo A Marco Cota Gloria Fisher Colleen Gamboa A Leticia Hector Rick Hrdlicka A	Celia Huston Haragewen Kinde Sheri Lillard A Robert Shields James Smith Nori Sogomonian Scott Stark Cassandra Thomas
--	--

TOPIC	DISCUSSION and ACTION
Approval of January 23, 2012 minutes	The minutes were approved via email by majority vote on 2/7/13 and posted to the College Council website.
Accreditation	<p>Celia presented the new evaluation responsibilities (for compliance with the US Department of Education Regulations) with regard to our institutional set standards on student success and student learning as they relate to our institution and mission to the group (handouts attached).</p> <p>The updates will need to be put into place and recorded to complete one cycle by the end of next year. A process needs to be established to do the following things: incorporate the set standards into existing or developing plan process, embed into the planning documents which are measures of the core competencies, and circle it around a continuous cycle of improvement (all under the umbrella of the campus mission and in support of it).</p> <p>After discussion among the group consensus was to share the information among the following groups for their involvement in the decision making to identify and tailor the standards: Academic Senate, Student Government, Deans, Management, and Classified. Once standards are set and tailored the group will need to show evidence of what has been transpired, analyze the gaps, and come up with strategies to bridge the gaps.</p> <p>Celia will present to the listed groups and bring the feedback to this group. Following, the next step will be to tailor the standards.</p>

Strategic Planning	<p>James reviewed a model the process of converting data collected (SWOT survey) from stakeholders (students, staff, faculty and community members) into goals, objectives and initiatives for the Strategic Planning document. This plan will be written in a manner that will be incorporated into and coordinate with other campus planning documents, it will serve as the master plan for achieving the mission of the college. The document will also be a basis to identify weaknesses and address them, and continue to build on strengths (see attachments: <i>2011-12 SWOT Survey Results, Summary of Comments from Campus and Community Stakeholders for the SBVC Strategic Plan 2013</i>).</p> <p>The group gave consensus that this group will be the center of taking the data, making decisions about goals, objectives, time tables, and converting those into information that makes a coherent strategic plan.</p> <p>James will bring a list of all other plans on campus to the next meeting so that they can be part of the discussion and linked to the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>James administered an <i>Image and Character Survey</i> (attached) to the group and the individual survey responses were discussed in breakout sessions and reported back to the entire group. The summary of the results will be available at the February 27th meeting for further discussion.</p>
Prioritization for filling positions	The group gave consensus to use the Program Review recommendations for prioritization of faculty positions.
Construction	Tabled
Student Learning Outcomes	Tabled
Committee Reports	Tabled
Budget Committee	Tabled
OTHER:	

**Institutions must set standards for satisfactory performance of student success
(student achievement and student learning)**

Recent regulations require institutions to set standards for student achievement: These standards may be tailored to the institution and its mission. The regulations also require accreditors to ask institutions to assess their own performance against the institution set standards for student achievement.

(ACCJC Letter 1/31/13)

34 CFR 602.16 (a) (1) (i). Standards must effectively address success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institutions mission... including as appropriate **course completion, licensing examinations, and job placement rates.**

34 CFR 602.17 (f). Agency reports must assess institutional performance with respect to institution-set student achievement standards

Evaluation teams **examine the institution-set standards for student success and achievement and assess their appropriateness.** Evaluation teams examine intuitional summary data on course completion rates, licensure pass rates where available, and job placement rates where available. The team also **examines program/certificate completion data and graduation data** provided by the college. These **data are examined in the context of the institution-set standards of satisfactory performance and goals for improvement of student success** (student achievement and student learning). The evaluation team cites this information as evidence of the institution's accomplishment of mission. The evaluation teams report cites the use of this evidence in describing its evaluation of how well the institution fulfills its mission. *(from: ACCJC External Evaluation Team Responsibilities for Compliance with U.S. Depart of Education Regulations... See also attached letter from ACCJC)*

What institution-set standards do we need to consider?

- Couse Completion
- Licensing Examination
- Job Placement
- Program/Certification completion
- Graduation

Additionally we should consider institution-set standards for

- Retention
- Persistence
- Success Rate
- Core Competencies

Commission will assess the appropriateness of institution-set standards/goals

- Need to have a rationale for the standards of student success that we set.

Data examined in the context of the institution-set standards of satisfactory performance and goals for improvement of student success

- Consider having separate institution-set standards for Basic Skills classes

Thoughts

- Campus should consider embedding institution-set standards for student success in our strategic plan.
- Institution-set standards for student success should be one of the measures of our core competencies (almost as if institution-set standards are SLOs). For instance an institution-set standard such as “Student’s will achieve a grade of “B” or above in all 100 level Courses” could be mapped to CC 1.1; 1.2; 3.3; 6.1. This would define an institution-set standard; measure the core competencies; allow us to do an analysis of our core competencies and create a continuous cycle of improvement.