Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes  
ART 216 | September 9, 2011 12:30 PM

Present: Deanna Abma, Beth Cataldo, Ophelia Clark, Lidia Jenkins, Phyllis McGuire, Lindy McKnight, Gohar Momjian, Madeline Mueller, Alice Murillo, Andrea Niosi, John Rizzo, James Rogers, Karen Saginor, Fred Teti

1. **Minutes** The Committee approved the 2011 August 26 minutes.

2. **Progress Report**
   - The review draft has been published as bound copy and online.
   - Steve Spurling will update the data charts before final printing.
   - The references still need attention, especially in the Eligibility section. Andrea Niosi is working on these and arrangements are being made for additional help.
   - The Committee agreed that notes for the data charts should follow each chart immediately instead of being put into footnotes.
   - Formatting the references in tables may be problematic and expensive. The Steering Committee discussed alternative options for design and printing. Gohar Momjian will consult with the Chancellor about the process moving forward. Members expressed willingness to serve on a work group.

3. **College-wide Review**
   - Jeffrey Fang has volunteered to solicit feedback from student groups.
   - Listening Team members have begun contacting committee chairs to arrange for times at meetings to solicit feedback. Deanna agreed to maintain a master list of these meetings and to direct interested participants thereto.

4.A **Review of the Data Section**
   - Karen entreated the Committee to read the environmental data on pp 10ff in advance of the next meeting to consider such questions as: Should the charts numbered 2.1 be disaggregated by economic groups?
   - Phyllis pointed out the need for more economic indicators such as percentage of CTE students in credit classes, numbers of BOGG waivers, and financial aid increases.
   - Phyllis, Beth, and Steve Spurling will work on improving the data section.

4.B **Review of the Major Findings**
   - Karen pointed out that the Planning Agendas are ambitious and some are not sensible out of context. Some aren’t “findings” and belong in the Evaluation sections.
   - Some members were concerned that we have plans labeled “Findings”. Karen will research WASC’s definitions of these terms.

5. **Preparation for the Visit**
   - Gohar reported that the room currently under consideration for the visiting team is the Rosenberg employee lounge.
   - We do not yet know the visiting team’s expectations for tech support and accommodations.
   - Karen and Gohar will start collecting the hardcopy evidence for the room.

Minutes submitted by Fred Teti.