MEETING MINUTES


I. Co-Chair Reports:

It was generally noted that there needs to be better agreement on stylistic matters like references, footnotes, and ratings. It was also agreed that an editorial group or writer(s) would review the final reports and revise them for continuity purposes.

Each of the co-chairs reviewed the commendations and recommendations for their standards highlighting areas that need improvement. Some of the highlights are listed below for each committee.

Standard I (Co-Chairs: Susan Lopez and Bruce Smith): While it was widely agreed that the College does a good job of planning at all levels of the institution, there was some concern about linkages of plans to budget and of the assessment process itself. The program review process was also raised as an area for improvement, although it was noted that the College has one of the best in the state. To the extent that the review is integrated with the annual budget requires some clarification. There was also debate over what “program” review should be evaluating—individual programs or departments?

Standard II:
Section A (Co-Chairs: Brian Ellison and Raymond Gamba):

Some stylistic issues on the reports were raised in the discussion of IIA; namely, that of footnotes. Some of the Steering Committee members felt the notes were too lengthy and could be accomplished with references to the sources instead of writing out the source in the body of the co-chair report. In addition, the reporting style of the IIA co-chairs (standard-by-standard) was debated due to the redundancy factor. Some feel, however, that this level of detail and attention to nuances of each standard question ultimately produces a more comprehensive and valid analysis and that the “streamlining” of information would occur in the next phase of the study. The overall breadth and scope of the report was praised.

Section B (Co-Chairs: Ophelia Clark and Jane Lualhati):
To be presented at the next Steering Committee.
Section C (Co-Chairs: Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer and Andrea Noisi):
The report was praised for its section on “writing to themes,” which drew out all six theme topics from the body of the co-chair report narrative. Again, stylistic differences between the reports were debated.

Standard III:
Section A (Co-Chair: Lety Santana-Sazo):
To be presented at the next Steering Committee.

Section B (David Liggett):
To be presented at the next Steering Committee.

Section C (Co-Chair: Mamie How):
To be presented at the next Steering Committee.

Section D (Peter Goldstein):
To be presented at the next Steering Committee.

Standard IV (Co-Chairs: Stephen Kech, Lawrence Klein, and David Yee):
It was suggested that this report include more examples from the templates themselves rather than relying predominantly on references to these templates.

II. Committee Actions

After lengthy discussion and with some suggested modifications, the Steering Committee unanimously accepted the four reports with stated modifications.

Also let the record reflect that the Steering Committee formally approved the proposed composition of the six theme-based committees for Spring 2005.

III. Next Meeting and Workshops

- The next meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled for Monday, December 13 at 3:30 p.m. at R-518

- Spring theme orientation are scheduled for Friday, January 14, at 2:15 p.m. in R-304, followed by breakout sessions in Science Hall (see Flex booklet for details)

- A second theme orientation is scheduled for Friday, January 21, at 1 p.m. in Science 100