

## Breakout Session

- New model has no greater risk for loss of accreditation.
- New process for moving to new degree levels.
- Are there lessons learned?
- Start early, build momentum, keep up the pressure, add in upcoming reports; contingency for feedback.
- Standard 2 – how much sense does it make? It's the old process.
- How difficult was theme development?
- It was similar to the strategic priorities, took time to consider possibilities cabinet retreat!
- What involvement was there of unions?
- Buy-in built over time based on membership.
- Administration took steps to free up time for participation – effectiveness, for example.
- With core themes, do you have indicators for each one?
- It does not appear each will have an indicator –still early.
- Is the library across all themes?
- The core themes map on functional areas.
- Resources – how are these supporting core themes?
- This is what we do – theme doesn't change. How we do it does change.
- The 7 year cycle – attributes?
  - Many have 5 year plans.
- The first cycle is condensed; should this match the plan? This takes re-thinking.
- Do core themes change? If they do change, when do they, early?
- Every other year there are updates, cumulative – in the 8<sup>th</sup> year – shift continuous assignment – institution memory.
- If mission changes, do the core themes change?
  - Legislation
  - Timeframe – continuous cycle, choice is 7 years.
- Mission – whole to the part; small adjustments (hour glass metaphor) alignment is critical. Core themes will be measured in Standard 2.
- Mission updates – changes less in Standard 1 & 5.
- Core themes – if they are broad, may not change so much.
- Less is more – core themes 5 to 7 suggested. Too many are difficult.
- With many programs much detail is not wanted.
- Challenge to have broad participation, but not visit everyone (program).
- Evaluators will have expertise, training is yet to be designed.
- Exhibit guidelines – some guideline is needed.
- What is sufficient evidence?
- Is this more quantitative data & less qualitative data?
- Use of template, data warehouse, both data and narrative updates tie in with student outcomes.
- If you have qualitative assurance in place, then examples could be given. Not every program analysis.
- Was there excitement for new process?
  - Yes, the switch built on the positive start they had.
- Is there a comparison with this on IPEDS?
- State performance, Perkins measures may be useful.
- How could annual reports be improved?
- Structured approach programs of study on record.

- Grand majority see new guidelines as positive.
  - Focus strategically.
  - Use indicators you have makes sense.
  - Useful process vs. burden someone.
  - Going from compliance to improvement.
  - This model is accessible to faculty; faculty viewed outcomes as punitive – this process is less so.
  - Can the fresh new ideal be preserved over time? Will it change over time?
  - Switch created excitement at any entry point.
  - 4 themes indicators:
    - Chosen themes – are there indicators for each?
      - Yes – each of these has measures.
    - Adjust plan to fit this new process.
    - Does commission mentor on themes.
      - Year/report will result in feedback.
    - What if feedback shows chosen theme is a value?
      - Comments come back from year 1, progressive reports – meant to be cumulative.
      - Feedback in timely manner – serious concern for 2011 reports.
      - Can 2011 be phased in?
    - Can there be timed interaction?
  - Commissioner says session to raise awareness seeking feedback.
  - Steering team – who is responsible for various roles?
  - Steering committee has grown relative to functional units, appropriate to subgroups; will continue to grow – college curious & volunteer.
  - Final report – Office of Academic Affairs. First report smaller. Others contribute.
  - Steering committee expansion; the process shows need for expertise (facilities), based on need.
  - Meetings weekly, leaders weekly, want high level leaders.
  - Schedule of Standard 3 visits in 2011, how can this happen?
  - Training is lead concern – make volume smoother – pilot will instruct evaluator still have training yet.
  - Early stages were organizational – old standards some difficult moments.
  - There is overlap – like Standard 2 – mostly they started from scratch in the 3 year process.
  - New model liked – it makes strategic plan more succinct. Ties together more processes, more meaning.
-