Commitments Cited by Responsible Parties:

Recommendation #1 (Planning – per S. McKinnon)
- To hopefully get Classified Professionals on the Student Access and Success Committee;
- To discuss the greater role of department chairs soon (has been placed on A. Duarte’s next meeting agenda);
- To write to various people requesting evidence;
- To stress the importance of showing how program review and planning is affecting budget decisions in the report; and how the college is evaluating the effectiveness of the process.

Recommendation #2 (SLOs – Y. Bellisimo)
- To be representing COM in the first group of schools ACCJC evaluates for SLOs (reason the whole report was written, as opposed to a proto-draft); ACCJC to visit COM in May;
- To add more examples if provided (encouraged people to send more).

Recommendation #3 (Distance Education – D. Snyder)
- To continue to compile evidence (A. Klinger);
- (Instructional area needs) to take the lead on staffing;
- To define a mission statement for distance education which includes the “need we are addressing” (e.g., to complete general education requirements) (D. Snyder).

Recommendation #5 (Student Support Services – N. Schorske)
- To exceed standards;
- To create a student services council which continually assesses student services based on students’ experiences; each member to become responsible for talking with at least ten students about suggestions for improvement;
- To survey students (day, evening and transfer);
- To assess student’s ability to effectively find and deal with services soon and then again in August to test for improvement;
- To institute a proposed new schedule for evening services developed in collaboration with B. Balestreri and A. Phillips.

Recommendation 7 (Facilities Plan – S. McKinnon for L. McCarty)
- To demonstrate a link to the Educational Master Plan;
- To point to evidence that COM is using data to make decisions;
- To work on prioritized remaining projects (citing plan is half done);
- (Recommendation was made) to designate someone to think about what the report will look like.
Recommendation 8 (Technology Plan – per A. Harrison)

- To continue to edit the plan;
- To emphasize sustainability, communication, and regular evaluation of the plan;
- To address everything COM has done.

REMINDERS:

- **Writer/Each Group:** To produce and complete their first draft of reports within the next two weeks:
  - refer back to previously distributed *Points to Consider*;
  - use persuasion to make the argument that COM has met and exceeded the recommendation;
  - describe the process from beginning to end, including the “who’s” in “a narrative analysis” (per ACCJC’s Follow-Up Report instructions) (no spell check necessary);
  - focus on the draft, not citing the evidence yet (but do post the evidence as you get it);
  - (recommended to get two to three people to read the reports and provide feedback).

- **E. Buckley and J. Speak** agreed to distribute a template by the upcoming Friday for creation of draft reports.
- **E. Buckley** to address all accreditation standards in reports.
- **J. Arnold** to review Recommendation 2’s Assessment Plan and recommendation narrative.
- **C. Hsieh** indicated report’s evidence will be formatted using an appendix format (not endnotes).
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