

December 3, 2010

Tim Adell, Victor Valley
Francisco Arce, El Camino
Holly Bailey-Hofman, West Los Angeles
Denise Cabañel-Bleuer, Orange Coast
Linda Diaz, Mt. San Antonio
Gwen DiPonio, Crafton Hills
Leona Fisher, Chaffey
Joe Holliday, El Camino
Scott Howell, Santiago Canyon
Carolyn Kuykendall, Mt. San Antonio
Maureen Mason, Long Beach City
Danielle Muller, LA City

John Oakes, Grossmont
Erik Ozolins, Mt. San Jacinto
Lynn Polasek, Los Angeles City
Kay Ryals, Irvine Valley
Kathleen Sell, Riverside City
Jean Shankweiler, El Camino
Suzanne Spangler, East Los Angeles
Liz Strother, Los Angeles Pierce
Darrell Thompson, El Camino
Jeanne Venditti, Irvine Valley
Brian Waddington, Citrus
Christina Yamanaka, Mt. San Jacinto

Draft

- I. Call to Order:** Kathleen called the meeting to order at 11:07. Joe welcomed us to El Camino and introduced Jean Shankweiler, the originator of the Irvine conference and the college's current dean of Natural Sciences; Darrell Thompson, his co-director; and Francisco Arce, VP of Academic Affairs at El Camino.
- II. Conference Committee:** Erik summarized the November meeting, talking about the conference and how we will make sure what happens the day of the conference moves smoothly. He emphasized that all students need to notify Carolyn; the information goes through her, so it is centralized. Erik and Chris Sleeper met this week and plan on having the rough program done by the end of January, so we can clear up all discrepancies in the descriptions. February 25 will be the deadline for all changes in the program. We will have a hidden link which will tell us if all the submissions we sent actually have been recorded. The conference component of the website went up on November 29. Denise emphasized that it is clearer now that application to present and registration are the same thing. Honors directors need to check the site right after registering to make sure all the information is correct. We will not be getting confirmation emails. She has taken out phone numbers for mentors and directors, lowered the number of required fields. Erik said we want to update the database as we go; however, after February 25, we will concentrate exclusively on the conference. We prefer that directors submit all names. If we let students submit their own proposals, we need to check the site often to make sure the information is correct. She has enhanced the questions about an information on "family and friends." We are avoiding a multi-tier system of differing name tags and perks. Joe asked if we have sent out a template for new directors to prompt students on how to do their presentations.
- Issues Forum:** Corporate Personhood: Should Corporations in the United States Have Some or all of the Legal Rights of Citizens? John emphasized that, though the topic may not initially be gripping, the importance is central. The students will be

notified on February 5 whether they will be accepted to present. Erik emphasized how much students have benefited from taking positions different from what we actually believe. Erik said we are planning on giving a half-page to the Issues Forum in the program. We are looking for more than three applications. Students need to submit their applications, writing on one of the three positions, through their directors to John. Kathleen reminded us to send her names and titles of administrators to send them invitations to the conference. Erik said we have 240 slots available right now, and we could possibly add about 20 to that. It is the same as last year if we don't use the two rooms we have in reserve. Erik said we need to emphasize posters, as an easy way to include more presenters. John brought up increasing the number and monetary value of prizes for posters. Joe said he wants to have more scholarships with lower awards, as the resume item is more important than the money. Carolyn said 15% of the entries in the poster competition are winning awards, which is a good number. We discussed whether poster prizes should be awarded per person or divided between those making the posters. We discussed how to decide the categories if we split into, say, a humanities category and a sciences category. Denise moved that the judges decide the categories and award up to two honorable mentions. It was seconded and approved. Erik said that we are going to get a student from IVC who is now at UCI, and we will ask him to be our student judge the posters. We are getting one representative from UCI, and we want to get an administrator from one of our schools as well. Erik asked us to encourage our students to apply to be volunteers. We will start judging abstracts about December 30. We will divide into teams because of the large number of submissions we expect. He reminded us again to discourage PowerPoint. We will have to use the overhead projectors from IVC again this year.

We adjourned for a working lunch at 12:10 and reconvened at 12:30

Erik suggested directors vet the submissions before submitting the abstracts.

- III. Reports:** Carolyn spoke to Jennifer Saito about the Bay Area consortium's conference. The deadline for students to submit there is mid-February. It will be in Stanford in 2011 and Berkeley in 2012. UC Riverside has offered to accept some of our students to present at their conference after Irvine.

Transfer Committee: The only update of the transfer agreement is that **Cal Poly Pomona** has withdrawn priority transfer status, though they are willing to give tours. Students can apply for their honors program when they come to the school. **UC Berkeley** gives one extra point in the application to a student applicant who has indicated participation in a California community college honors program. **Chapman** has renewed their agreement. **CSU Fullerton** will require 3.5 GPA from students outside their attendance area. Carolyn will send **Columbia** an HTCC letter, which establishes an HTCC presence with them. Susan reminded us to have students keep in mind that expenses in New York can sometimes scuttle their academic careers there.

Treasurer's Report: Jeanne has put out a notification. We have a balance of \$16,322.

President's Report: Darrell passed a survey out and added a question about whether any member schools require three semesters of membership in our programs. Several

schools have programs students could theoretically finish in one semester; the standard is that most schools' programs may be finished, theoretically, in two semesters. Maureen and Kathleen brought up the question of bringing in assessment systems for our honors program. Susan has students fill out a survey explaining which critical thinking skills they have incorporated in their classes. About a third are starting assessments connected to SLOs. Lynne says her program self-assesses in two categories: program completion and public service. Kathleen said her program does its own conference in the fall, which it uses to assess student achievement. They are using this as a starting point. Erik's program has only one stand-alone honors class, which means that SLOs for honors classes would be irrelevant. They have not gotten pressure to start toward assessment. They have bought themselves some time by writing departmental outcomes, such as awards students have won and events they have participated in. Maureen talked about how she has brought up program review and emphasized how important program review and SLOs are for accreditation. The SLOs will be the same for honors and non-honors, as the only difference is qualitative not quantitative. She thought about what we might bring up that are quantitative to use as assessment. She used the percentage of honors students who could enroll in an honors class per semester and the percentage who consulted the honors counselor for service unit outcomes. She wants to increase the variety of offerings. She gave us a handout demonstrating how she has done it. SLOs and in-place documentation are the practices accreditation is looking for. Money is becoming attached to SLOs, which are increasingly attached to assessment. Denise suggested writing assessable functions so that if they are low, they provide support for increased program funding. Kathleen and Maureen said we need to get in front of this issue, so we don't end up with No Child Left Behind, K-14.

IV. For the Good of the Order: John said January 28 they are hosting a conference, Reinventing California, community college to university conference. Students should contact John and Alison if they are interested in presenting. Maureen wanted to find out information on the transfer rate of honors students against that of students in general. She found that they were defining "honors" as a student who had taken any honors class. Pierce College found about a 20% growth of acceptance to UCLA of honors over non-honors. Susan contacts UCs and checks the list of students who have applied there with the students in her program. She can show student success by the percentages of students who have been accepted into different places. She has the data always in mind. Kay asked if there was a way the HTCC can get data from the UCs for our organization as a whole or for the individual colleges. Denise suggested the organization make out a guide for directors. Maureen suggested that for program-improvement purposes, we need to know all applicants and how they do, so we know what to improve. Denise talked about bringing up a faculty-driven measure of academic success. Susanne brought up the National Student Clearinghouse, which stores data for students from community college through graduate school. It is difficult and must be done by each college but might be a good program for our organization. Joe suggested making a completion survey mandatory for the program. This provides great data after the completion. Kathleen said we need to bring up best practices on this over the break.

V. Adjournment: We adjourned at 1:40.