Library and Learning Support Services Committee
MINUTES     OCTOBER 21, 2005     12:40-1:40     LIBRARY WORKROOM

MEETING CALLED BY     Celia Brockenbrough
TYPE OF MEETING     Regular Monthly Meeting
FACILITATOR     Celia Brockenbrough
NOTE TAKER     Susan Mazur-Stommen
TIMEKEEPER     N/A
ATTENDEES     Tamara Caponetto, Rene Diaz, Margarita Shirinian, Judy Perhamus, Miguel Castro, John Coverdale, Susan Mazur-Stommen, Celia Brockenbrough

ABSENTEES        Katherine Faircloth, Richard Ries, Ray Myers (student representing tutorial services)

Agenda topics
10 MINUTES     INTRODUCTIONS/SUMMARY OF CO-CHAIRS MTG     CELIA
DISCUSSION     Summary of Co-chairs meeting September 30, 2005, and Accreditation Retreat October 6 and 7th, 2005.

CONCLUSIONS
Vote was taken authorizing Celia and Tamara to represent the committee to the co-chairs meeting.

ACTION ITEMS     PERSON RESPONSIBLE     DEADLINE
Get items to Celia for wish-list     All     10/27
Ex. Dedicated test preparation room/staff member

10 MINUTES      COLLECTING EVIDENCE FOR ACCREDITATION     CELIA
DISCUSSION     What is evidence? Who collects it? Who is responsible for which particular items? For example, the library itself will remain a centralized institution even under the new three college system. This will limit the autonomy any single college will have over determining areas of acquisition and management.
According to Celia’s reportage from the retreat, the 2007 accreditation process will hinge on “evidence, evidence, evidence.” We all have areas of responsibilities (more later) and we will be responsible for generating/acquiring evidence to support those specific areas. We started by defining areas of evidence that falls under our purview – for LLSS that means Tutors, Writing Ctrs, Math and Computer Labs, Foreign Language labs...

CONCLUSIONS     We looked at the Guide to Evaluating Institutions page 43. We went over the various types of evidence required for certain activities. Some are more readily available than others – description of quantities is ‘easy’ to generate. Other types of evidence might require more creativity – some suggestions were – Video Training of tutors, instruments like calculators, the extension of purchasing ability to staff as well as faculty. In order to get hard data concerning student learning outcomes, we might have to conduct a faculty survey, for instance.

ACTION ITEMS     PERSON RESPONSIBLE     DEADLINE
Ask at the next co-chairs meeting about whether the CIS labs also fall under Standard IIIC.     Celia     10/28/2005

10 MINUTES     PROCEDURE AND PROCESS FOR INFORMING SPCS     GROUP
DISCUSSION     Per the SPC Meeting on Thursday, October 20th, everyone was apprised of the new ‘forum’ online.
CONCLUSIONS  We will be using this forum to connect with other committees, share our views, receive feedback on our proposed plans, and answer questions.

ACTION ITEMS  PERSON RESPONSIBLE  DEADLINE
Taking a turn answering questions  Susan  Nov. 1
- possibly monthly per suggestion by Dr. Lindsay (?) at SPC mtg

10 MINUTES  MEMORIAL TO WILFRED AIREY  GROUP DISCUSSION
DISCUSSION  Celia reported that co-workers of Dr. Airey’s son donated $625.00 for a memorial to Dr. Airey. She had already spoken to Karin Skiba and asked for recommendations for an artist who could paint a portrait from a picture of Dr. Airey. Karin suggested an art student due to the amount of money. Celia declined, but still presented this idea to the committee. The committee is unsure as to the level of expertise of the students.

One proposal was a full body portrait to hang in the library, possibly one from a photograph. Susan suggested that a photo might be obtained from a local paper. Tamara was very pro the student idea and the committee agreed that she talk to Karin again about student prowess.

CONCLUSIONS  In addition to a portrait, the library is purchasing copies of his thesis and dissertation from the University of Washington. Susan suggested a glass case to hold a photo, the dissertation, other mementos, in lieu of a portrait.

ACTION ITEMS  PERSON RESPONSIBLE  DEADLINE
Talk again to K. Skiba about student prowess  Tamara  Next meeting

10 MINUTES  RESPONSIBILITIES/ASSIGNMENTS  GROUP
DISCUSSION  What exactly are our roles? Who is replacing whom? We reviewed the proposed timeline for accreditation activities, as well as the handout marked ‘copy’. Reviewed groups for areas.

CONCLUSIONS  Review and Assess Current Instructional Services – Celia, Rene, Judy, John; Investigate and Implement Classroom Technology – Rene, Michael, Miguel, Susan; Facilitate development and review of equipment replacement plans – Rene, Michael, Miguel; Review and Discuss discipline program reviews – John, Judy, Margarita, Susan; Provide forum – Kathy, Margarita, Tamara, Ray, Michael; Provide input – everybody.

ACTION ITEMS  PERSON RESPONSIBLE  DEADLINE
Find out if responsibilities on ‘copy’ sheet match up with ‘evidence’ required on accreditation standards. In other words, if the parties responsible for their area do the write-up, does it need to go over the ground covered in evidence (for each sub-section) exactly?  Celia  10/28

OBSERVERS
RESOURCE PERSONS
SPECIAL NOTES  Next meeting – December 2nd, 12:40-1:40. library workroom