Standard II, Meeting Notes
Friday, October 29th 2010, Admn. 109

Present at the meeting:

Rowena Tomaneng (meeting coordinator)
Ram Subramaniam (note taker)
April Qian (II A)
Ann Leever (II C)
Shan Pasqual
Esther Halwani
Stephanie Sherman
Judith Clavijo
Anu Khanna

• Rowena read the email from Gregory
• Ann L said that Gregory had set the deadline for II C at Nov. 9th, so it is probably not possible to have a draft by the senate meeting
• Rowena informed us that tri-chairs are the ones presenting at the Academic Senate meeting. They have been giving an overview of when things are due for the writers. So, the presentation for the next Senate meeting will be probably (?) done by Christina, Gregory, and Mary Kay?
• Stephanie informed that subcommittees have deadlines. These deadlines/timelines can be presented to the Senate at the November 8th meeting. We probably need more faculty working on Standard II, considering how this is all to do with instruction. It will also be good to have input from Academic Senate, perhaps they could come and work with this committee.
• Ann suggested that at the Senate meeting a brief presentation with one slide per sub-standard could including: timelines, who is working on which topics could be presented.
• II B. will have its first draft on November 9th; everything will be ready by this date. These will be more or less done on the 9th, and a next deadline will be determined that day.
• II A. today is first due date to bring up “red flags”. Nov. 15th is the due date for a first draft. Dec 1st is when the final draft will go forward.
• II C. First draft will be ready on Nov. 11th, final rough draft- Nov. 24th, and the final draft- Dec 6th.
• Format and Structure: Follow same format from the 2005 round. Document will be cut/paste/edit/add new information. These documents will be sent to one central place and formatted “globally” to look similar in format overall.
• How should the reference documents be included? We should have all the reference documents online. Then the references should just include the website where these documents are all posted. If any of the reference documents are missing, these would be “red flags”. All the document references from 2005 should be online. And we will reference the specific site. If any of the documents can not be found online, that would then be a
red-flag and we will need to make sure they go online. For documents within password protected areas (such is an portal or ECMS), guest accounts should be made available to reviewers so they can access these sites.

- Esther asked about if we should include SSLOs in the current draft, and Stephanie informed that it is absolutely essential to include these to whatever level we have them now. Need to ask Jim Haynes where the master site for the SSLOs is, so that the site can be used to reference in the “Student Services” section.

- Rowena brought up questions about “Planning Agendas”. Should we have any minimum or maximum number of planning agenda items. Stephanie suggested that it is not a good idea to have any minimum or maximum number on these. This is an as-needed section. Some items may need no planning agendas, some may need more.

- Are there any questions we should ask the Academic Senate? There are no specific questions, but they could come to our meetings to help out with specific questions that we may have.

- Recommendation: Look at accjc website for recently accredited colleges; go to the college website, go to their accreditation web sites, and look at their self study documents.

- Meeting adjourned and sub-committee meeting for II A commenced.