ACC Meeting Name: Achieving Excellence Committee

Draft Minutes

Meeting Date: November 21, 2008

Time: 9:00 am to 11:00 am **Location:** HBC, Room 411

Chair: Soon Merz

Members Present: D'Maris Allen-Mierl, Sheila Ammons, Kathleen Christensen, Steve Clary, Ron Johns, Mike McCarthy, Soon Merz, Nancy Miller, Caryn Newburger, Charles Quinn, and Roslyn Wallace.

Absent: David Borden, Juston Braden, Zach Corbell, Sandy Gaskin, Sylvia Galvan Gonzalez, Lyman Grant, Norma Jacobs, Virginia Lawrence, Mike Midgley, Theresa Moore, Martha Perez, Kyle Pierce, Margaret Reid, Chris Rosales, C. Jason Vidrine, Kathy Walton, Julie Wauchope, and Diane Whitley-Bogard.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: Opening comments and welcome to the AEC meeting.

Decisions: None

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: None

Agenda Item 2: Review and Approve Past Minutes

Presenter: All

Discussion: Discussion: The minutes for October 17, 2008 meeting were reviewed and amended to highlight the importance of the upcoming Quality Enhancement Plan, and language referring to a 2013 SACS visit was deleted. The adjournment time of the preceding meeting was corrected.

Decisions/Actions: Professor Allen-Mierl motioned to approve the minutes with changes. The motion was seconded by Soon Merz, and the minutes of the October 17th meeting were approved as amended.

Agenda Item 3: Election of AEC Co-Chair

Presenter: Mike McCarthy

Discussion: Mike asked for nomination of candidates or volunteers to serve as co-chair of the committee for this year. After discussion, Professor Ron Johns stepped forward and agreed to serve with AVP Soon Merz as co-chair of the AEC for the remainder to the academic year.

Decisions: Professor Johns was elected unanimously.

Follow Up Items and Responsible person:

Agenda Item 4: Panel Discussion on Instructional Program Review

Presenter: Karry Evans, Gale Spear and Ron Johns

Discussion: At invitation of the AEC, Assistant Professor of Government Karry Evans and Professor of Child Care and Development Gale Spear agreed to participate in a panel discussion on Instructional Program Review (IPR) and Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). When another presenter was unable to attend for reason of illness, Co-Chair Johns sat with the panel to share his experiences with IPR and QIP. The panelists spoke in turn.

Assistant Professor Evans spoke first, remarking that

- 1. IPR involves a lot of writing and may discourage participation
- 2. SWOT analysis produced useful information for creating a QIP which resulted in course redesign
- 3. IPR is useful for new or junior faculty to learn about the department
- 4. Lack of feedback after completing the IPR process is frustrating

Professor Spear agreed with many of the observations, adding

- 1. The small size of the CHCD program allowed full participation of faculty
- 2. CHCD has limited fiscal resources to implement a QIP
- 3. Also expressed frustration at lack of feedback after IPR/QIP

Professor Johns noted

- 1. IPR/QIP should be integral to planning and Master Planning. Johns cited the approved astronomical observatory to be built at Round Rock Campus first called for in IPR/QIP
- 2. Also expressed frustration at lack of feedback after IPR/QIP

The panel was asked about and discussed the role of student learning outcomes in IPR/QIP.

Decisions: The AEC will continue to explore ways to use student learning outcomes to improve planning.

Follow Up Items and Responsible person:

Agenda Item 5: Review Administrative and Educational Support Services Review

Presenter: Mike McCarthy

Discussion: The OIEA is continuing work on a review/planning process to replace the Internal College Survey. Mike distributed and reviewed a draft of proposed guidelines for an Administrative and Educational Support Services Review process. The guidelines had earlier been reviewed by a subcommittee of the AEC together with employee association leadership on November 5. The proposed process is to provide a common framework for identification of essential services and outcomes and to create plan for improvement across the offices of the college. The steps of the proposed process include

- 1. Identify the self-study chair and self-study committee members.
- 2. Identify AES support service's goals.
- 3. SWOT analysis.
- 4. Create a Quality Improvement Plan with assessments to establish the extent to which the service area achieved improvements.
- 5. Send a copy of your Non-Instructional Program Review Summary and Quality Improvement Plan to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability.

Decisions: The Committee suggested deletions and improvements to the draft.

Follow Up Items and Responsible person: The OIEA will continue to work on the new review/planning process and bring it back to the AEC before going forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 Next meeting: January 30, 2008 (Joint Meeting)