

## Breakout Session

- Accreditation will align with what colleges already do.
  - Nervous about where the time will come from to accomplish required tasks. No one person will be available to do the bulk of the work.
  - Curious to see how faculty will respond to a continuous process as opposed to an “event”.
  - How do you get buy in from everyone in choosing specific themes. Especially those that resemble values. Ex: Catholic Identity, Physical/Emotional well being ...
    - Identifying appropriate indicators seems to justify theme selection.
  - What does “ownership of synthesis” mean (coming from Carroll’s 2<sup>nd</sup> presentation).
    - Confusion from inconsistent terminology
    - For synthesis, faculty roles are critical. Some colleges can use committees already in place.
  - Are there themes that have raised concerns or you might consider changing prior to reporting Standard 1 your 2<sup>nd</sup> time through? (Directed to pilot representatives).
    - Mission statement review seems natural.
    - It is good to review these.
  - The economy adds an unfortunate complexity.
  - Questions about tracking assessment efforts.
    - Discussion on software used at CBC and Grays Harbor.
    - Does Banner have a module that would support this?
    - Perhaps the commission could lend support in identifying or developing software to support Standards 3 & 4.
  - Were your indicators to support themes already developed prior to being a pilot?
  - Another question for pilots: Was it difficult to identify your themes?
  - Faculty should be included more in this conference.
  - Are faculty less involved in the new process?
    - It appears so, which concerns some.
    - Perhaps faculty will be more involved in Program Assessment.
  - Where do athletic teams fit into the themes?
  - Everyone needs to hear how the pilots are progressing.
- 
-