

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)  
Unapproved Minutes  
October 4, 2011  
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Becky Mooney Kate Pluta (co-chair), Kirk Russell, Rachel Vickrey, Danitza Romo (SGA) , Ann Morgan, Sue Granger-Dickson, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), and Bonnie Suderman.

Absentees: Klint Rigby, Bernadette Towns, Billy Barnes, Rene Trujillo, Hamid Eydgahi, Joyce Ester, LaMont Schiers, and Diana Kelly .

**1. Review and approve minutes- pending**

**2. Report on action items**

Debbie Spohn will re-title and post Collegewide Committee Reports to SharePoint. Survey and focus groups updates; questions are due Thursday to Bonnie Suderman stating what information they need.

**Action: Send electronic version of Accreditation report to BOT to ASC.**

**3. SEC Update**

Rebecca Mooney suggested that those who are responsible for their recommendations need to report on them. Rebecca gave handouts citing the report on findings for recommendations and group reports on progress. Noted was missing information on some of the recommendations. Kate paused to introduce and welcome our SGA representative, Danitza Romo, a SGA senator to the committee. Joyce Ester questioned how should the responses be formatted when covering the recommendations? General answers or narrative? Kirk Russell had a formatting question about how the responses to the sub-standards are posted. They are currently grouped but should be separated out. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg suggested the responses to the sub-standards be segmented out. **(See handout for more detailed information)**

**4. Integrated Program Review**

Sue Granger- Dickson stated they have not met yet, so no report at this time.

**5. Planning**

Integrated Collegewide Planning is on the agendas for both Academic Senate (Wednesday) and College Council (Friday). Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg felt that BC is proactively operating in a scarce to limited resource environment per the chart whereas Sue felt that we were more reactive in the same environment and needing to be in the adequate to ample resource environment. **(See handout #2 Organizational research and planning assessment)** Sue also passed out a third handout out that gave a little insight to two key factors that define a college's relationship to planning, budgeting, and evaluation. **(See handout #3 Planning, Organizational Culture and Resources in CCC)**. Dr. Ester stated that the chart doesn't show a complete picture of where BC is in this process. What data determines BC placement in proactive vs. reactive? Rachel Vickery said transparency is the key. Bonnie Suderman stated that being reactive is not necessarily a bad thing. We can use it to our advantage. Sue Granger-Dickson suggested that we need to have a one-page description on our integrated college planning that could go to everyone so we know what questions are being addressed at other meetings. **(Please see Renee Trujillo's' notes on the agenda)**. Comments were also made about committees needing to do more on the evaluation process on a consistent basis.

**6. Communication from ACCJC**

Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi- Unit District or Systems (rev. June 2011) Discuss from previous meeting.

Adjourned- Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 11, 2011  
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Levinson 40