

Steering Committee Meeting
DRAFT Minutes
December 21, 2006
9 am, PCR

Attending: Patty Banday, Eloise Crippens, Dionne Morrisette for Joann Haywood, Fran Leonard, Ed Pai, Rod Patterson, Mark Rocha, Sherron Rouzan, Yvonne Simone, Bob Sprague, Paul Stansbury, Lloyd Thomas

- I. The meeting was called to order at 9:05 am by Dr. Rocha.
- II. Progress Report Next Steps and Deadlines
 - A. Dr. Rocha noted that 5 working weeks remain from today to submit the progress report to the Board of Trustees on February 6, 2007. The final report is due to ACCJC *by* March 15, 2007, including 3 hard copies and a version submitted electronically. Each team member receives a copy as well. Ed Pai mentioned that with regard to production, West submitted environmentally-friendly binders with a slip cover sheet and standard tabs to the BOT last year for the self study, giving the college more time on the production of the report for ACCJC.
 - B. Dr. Rocha asked chairs and co-chairs to preface their sections with a narrative that provides a context for their recommendations' reports.
 - C. The following dates were agreed to by the committee:
 - 1. January 4, 2007, Thursday – all final drafts of recommendations' reports submitted to Fran electronically for editing and the Executive Summary by Dr. Rocha.
 - 2. January 11, 2007, Thursday – a final sign-off report will be given to the Steering Committee
 - 3. January 18, 2007, Thursday, the Steering Committee meets at 9 am in PCR for signing of the final document
 - 4. Monday, March 12, 2006 – mail the 3 hard copies and email the report to ACCJC
- III. Format
 - A. Fran asked chairs and co-chairs to follow the formatting of Recommendation 9, which includes quotes from the ACCJC Evaluation document, committee meeting dates and members and a description of the process(es) the committee established to address their recommendations.
 - B. Olga suggested that we include an update that captures developments that occur after the final, signed document and leading to the team's visit, which will probably occur in mid-April.
 - C. Ed mentioned including in such an update any additional plans – like the planning agendas in the self study report – which emerge from the evaluations of actions to address the recommendations.
- IV. Dissent
 - A. The committee then discussed dissenting viewpoints, a topic that was discussed at the December 7, 2006 Town Hall meeting on the draft progress report. Subsequent to that meeting, Clyde Titus suggested that the steering committee consider an ombudsperson for those unaccustomed to voicing their views in committee meetings.
 - B. Olga suggested a committee, such as the ethics committee.
 - C. Dr. Rocha cited the journal of attributable feedback to the draft progress report that Fran has been documenting through the fall semester. He noted the distinctions between “ceremonial” governance, characterized by too-large committees and smaller groups, or “pods” that meet more often and informally to discuss and grapple with issues such as this. The important questions are: Why do some feel disconnected or feel as if they cannot speak through their representatives? Sharing the conversation as opposed to dominating it is an ethical consideration. Dionne suggested workshops on how to

communicate effectively and assertively. Sherron mentioned workshops being scheduled that Olga expressed interest in learning about more for inclusion in Rec. 1's report.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 am.

Dr. Rocha then met with Sherron and Patty with Yvonne, Paul Stansbury, Fran and Ed to go over Rec 6 specifically.