
* Co-Chairs

MEETING MINUTES

I. Status Reports: Co-Chairs

Brief synopses of the work of each Standard Committee were provided by co-chairs. Target dates for completion of templates is Oct. 31.

Standard I (Co-Chairs: Susan Lopez and Bruce Smith):
Eight of 11 templates are completed.

Standard II:

Section A (Co-Chairs: Brian Ellison and Raymond Gamba): First drafts for nine of the 25 template drafts are completed.

Section B (Co-Chairs: Ophelia Clark and Jane Lualhati):
Drafts for all 11 templates are completed and the entire committee is reviewing each as a group for quality control.

Section C (Co-Chairs: Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer and Andrea Niosi):
Four of seven templates are drafted.

Standard III:

Section A (Co-Chair: Lety Santana-Sazo):
Six first drafts have been completed. The rest are in outline format. There are 10 in total.

Section B (David Liggett):
Rewriting templates after viewing samples from another section.

Section C (Co-Chair: Mamie How):
Five of six are in draft format and submitted to one of the technology committees for review and comments.

Section D (Peter Goldstein):
Ten of 13 templates are drafted or assigned to be drafted. The rest are in outline format.

**Standard IV (Co-Chairs: Stephen Kech, Lawrence Klein, and David Yee):**
Three first drafts have been completed. The rest are in outline form.

**II. Co-Chair Report Structure**

A third version of the report structure was circulated for comments and discussion. An issue was raised about the page limit and the extent to which it was enough to accommodate a comprehensive report. It was agreed that the number of pages would vary by standard and that content was more important than length. Another concern was raised regarding possible redundancy of report since some standards questions are similar across Standards. It was decided that some redundancy was inevitable and not a problem, at least in the early stages of drafting these reports.

There was substantial discussion on Part 3 of the report structure, “major themes.” Some expressed interest in waiting until next semester to address the subject, when the focus of the project will be on themes. Others felt strongly that some attention to the issue now would facilitate the transition to themes and get us thinking about theme-related issues ahead of time.

Finally, it was suggested that Part 3 be renamed from Major Themes to “Key Findings and Relation to CCSF Themes.”

**III. Revised Draft Framework for Reflective Theme Essays**

There was agreement that more time and input was required on the formulation of questions for the reflective essays since these questions would be a trigger point for development of essay outlines. Some felt that the reorganization of committees from standards to themes would naturally produce new or different questions; others felt the Steering Committee as a whole should devote more time to reviewing the questions as a group in making determinations. It was also suggested that the questions be reviewed again once the co-chair reports are drafted, which will provide more context for evaluation.

**IV. General Discussion**

**Discussion: Student Forum**

A brief progress report on the student focus groups was provided. With an average of only two students attending each weekly meeting, the Steering Committee expressed concern about representation. Although the A.S. Executive Council, from which the students were being recruited, represents all of the CCSF campus/sites, the numbers of participants isn’t large enough
to truly reflect thoughts and opinions of a wide range of students. It was recommended that separate meetings be held at other campuses and that transcripts of each focus group be made available to the co-chairs and their committees for closer review.

A request was also made that the results of the last CCSF Student Survey be made available at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

The next meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled for Monday, Oct. 25, at 3 p.m. in Rosenberg 518.