

## ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE

Members Present: Brown, Chiriboga, Cole,.  
Ford, Gonzales, Johnson, McNeil, Nette,  
Riley, Satele, Wangler

A regular meeting of the Cuyamaca College Accreditation Steering Committee was held on March 3, 2006 in Room F106.



### Agenda Item

### Discussion

#### ***1. Approve Minutes***

The minutes were approved as submitted. M/S/A with two abstentions.

#### ***2. Student Survey Update***

Michael Wangler indicated the results from the Faculty and Staff were e-mailed to the committee for dissemination to their respective standard teams. Darlene Cole briefed the group on the Student Survey results. She fielded questions from the group on data interpretation. She also explained the column headings for the descriptive statistics.

Cristina Chiriboga explained the usefulness of including this data in their descriptive, evaluation and evidence section of their standards. The group reviewed and discussed the value of this data.

#### ***3. Review of Team Composition***

Each standard updated their committee composition. Jan Ford requested the list be mailed to the Academic Senate Vice President, Susan Haber in an effort to keep the Academic Senate informed of what faculty are serving on the accreditation standard teams.

#### ***4. Standard Updates***

Standard I: Kathryn Nette reported this

standard is currently working on the evaluations portion. She will be distributing the survey results at their meeting this afternoon. She updated the group on the progress concerning the district mission statement.

Standard II: Teresa McNeil updated the group on each of the subcommittees under this standard, and commended the current chairs on their draft submittals. Angela Nesta, Chair of Standard IIC, informed the group that this subcommittee is gathering evidence and moving forward to the evaluation component.

Standard III: Arleen Satele indicated subcommittees are working on gathering evidence and developing a matrix. She is setting up monthly meetings, and the survey results will be discussed at the next scheduled meetings.

She had a concern on items that are in the planning process, how to address in the evaluation section of the standard. C. Chiriboga instructed the group to explain the estimated completion date on items that are in progress or being initiated. There will be an opportunity to include a formal update and submit an addendum.

Standard IV: Jan Ford reported that they were fine tuning their description draft and planned on submitting to the group by March 15.

## ***6. Draft Review***

The committee systematically went through Standard I and II descriptive drafts and pointed out items to be included, any typographical or grammatical errors to be corrected, and other areas of campus to be considered in their descriptive answers.