Chancellor’s Message: Chancellor Mike Rota asked that we conduct a “stress test”—that is, a preliminary assessment of campus needs, so that we can address key problem areas and make changes, as needed, before completing our self-study. He noted that there are certain areas where we must be fully in compliance. These include, but are not limited to:

- Meeting General Education requirements within the CTE programs (a working group has been established to make recommendations here; the Underprepared Student Task Force is also involved in addressing issues of student preparedness, with changes already underway in remedial/development English and Math);
- Better documentation of dialogue and processes by which decisions are made (e.g., minutes from committees, especially those involved in governance);
- Program Reviews, especially for non-instructional units (e.g., Student Services will make use of a consultant to assist with this; one item of concern is a vague mission statement that does not lead to clear outcomes)
- Distance Learning assessment (e.g., if we observe that completion rates are down, do we know why, and what are we going to do about it?)

The Chancellor reiterated that the self-study committees should identify the problems or unfinished business that still exists, so we can address them now and thus achieve greater credibility in our report.

Another key issue is a better understanding of the planning process that the Chancellor is requiring the campus to follow, particularly as it means that we will no longer work with the expectation of allocating end-of-year funds separate from a more comprehensive budget planning process. This should flow from Program Review to budget requests to an integrated planning process that takes into account the broader strategic outcomes of campus and system.

The campus must also demonstrate that it is proficient in management and assessment of SLOs at course, program and institutional levels by Fall 2012. While HCC has made substantial progress at the first two levels, we have not really addressed the issue of institutional goals, so that should be an immediate task. VCAA Erika Lacro indicated that she was working with Assessment Specialist Ross Egloria on Program Review, and that they would be discussing Institutional Learning Outcomes.

Status Reports from Standards Co-Chairs: The co-chairs of each standard committee or sub-committee were asked to provide status reports on work to date:
I: Working to clarify status of discussion of mission statement; in this context, asked when evidence should be gathered.
IIA: Will meet today after Steering Committee meeting.
IIB: Will be meeting next week.
IIC: Met last spring and last week. The issues of staff participation and student participation in the self-study were raised, since those perspectives are critical to this Standard. The question of overlap was also raised as something like the adequacy of computer labs to support instruction is relevant both here and in Standard III (Technology resources).
Erika noted that that latest CCSSE survey results are now available, and that this would probably provide some relevant evidence for this standard as well.

IIIA: Meeting soon to assign specific tasks for follow-up.
IIIB: Met last spring and again last week to make specific assignments, identifying what is known and not known at this point. Standard III committees propose to make a **master list of evidence, identifying what is in hand and what is needed**.
IIIC: With the creation of the Technology Master Plan, the college has made significant progress in this context; the vision statement and objectives are already in place. As noted by Erika, this area will also be affected by the proposed re-organization of IT as well as the proposed reorganization of administration, which will affect MIR. The position of Dean of Student Services also will not be advertised until the reorganization of that unit is completed. The Academic divisions (especially Tech I) may also undergo some realignment. Greg Witteman noted that currently IT is not effectively organized to meet its intended responsibilities, but Erika thinks that will be addressed soon.
IIID: Met last spring and will meet next week. Ken Kato said it was all right for him to continue as co-chair of this committee. He is tasked with explaining the college’s “operational model.”

IV: Have had an initial meeting, and are beginning to work on the descriptive section now.

**Identifying collective needs:** One major question raised was what to use for surveys. Ross Egloria raised several pertinent questions regarding surveys that should help guide our planning: a) Look at past surveys—what was asked, and what was found out; b) based on past surveys, what needs to be added now; c) how should we roll out the survey (online would be best, but need to ensure computer access, especially for students); d) We need to try to **consolidate our data-gathering** so as to avoid survey overload, so a master list of needs/questions from all committees is key.

**Use of TaskStream:** Jonathan Wong has secured the use of TaskStream, an information management system that should provide a way to manage the development of our self-study. A small group of people will begin to build the basic structure of our site, and others (i.e., self-study co-chairs) will be trained starting in January 2011.

In terms of a current timeline, we should try to develop a master list of evidence by mid-November, complete an initial “stress test” by mid-December, and complete survey planning by mid-January.
The Steering Committee will meet again on December 10, 1 p.m.