



## MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE ■ ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE ■ MINUTES

**MARCH 1, 2024**  
**10:30A-12:00P – ZOOM**

### MEMBERSHIP

<input type="checkbox"/> KELLY FOWLER, CO-CHAIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BARBARA MEZAKI, CO-CHAIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VALERIE BILLER, CSEA 262	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINERVA AVILA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MICHAEL CARR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MEGHAN CHEN
<input type="checkbox"/> KELLY COREAS	<input type="checkbox"/> TIKA DAVE´-HARRIS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DIANA DZIB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PENNY PEIYING FENG	<input type="checkbox"/> L.E. FOISIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ALLIE FRICKERT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LIANNE MALDONADO-GREENLEE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BETA MEYER	<input type="checkbox"/> ROBERT MONTOYA, CSEA 651	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PATRICIA QUINONES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L R RODRIGUEZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MICHELLE SHEAR
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KOJI UESUGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MARYUM QURESHI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TANIA ANDERS			
<input type="checkbox"/> MICHELLE SAMPAT (GUEST)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CATHY STUTE (GUEST)				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WENDI ALCAZAR, RECORDER

	TOPIC	UPDATES/DISCUSSION	OUTCOME/ACTION
1.	Welcome Back (Kelly)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome Valerie Biller</li> </ul>	
2.	Agenda Review (Barbara/Allie)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewed</li> </ul>	
3.	Review of <a href="#">December 1<sup>st</sup></a> , Minutes (Barbara/Allie)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewed, V. Biller motions to approve the minutes, B. Miller seconds motion, approved with two abstentions.</li> </ul>	Minutes approved.
4.	Team Visit Highlights and Debrief (Kelly/Lianne)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Exit Report Summary:</b></li> <li>The Visiting Team was great to work with. They did a summary and spoke about the preliminary process.</li> <li>The Visiting Team did interviews with over sixty people. They took a campus tour and had a lot to say about tour facilities. They held a hybrid open forum on Wednesday afternoon. Online there were about sixty-five participants.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The next step is to review the report for errors, this will happen within the next 30 days.</li><li>• The report will then go to The Commission. This report is the Team’s recommendation; The Commission then makes the final decision.</li><li>• An ACCJC rep was also on campus and will be present when the commission makes its final recommendation.</li><li>• The Team congratulated us on being student-centered. They praised some of our exemplary programs.</li><li>• They could tell that we care about each other. It said a lot that they felt that we cared about one another.</li><li>• They also stated that we were already in the process of remedying any areas that need improvement.</li><li>• There is a strong desire to improve things with all groups. We all want to work together to meet the goals.</li><li>• Thank you to Dani Silva, she did a great job when speaking to the Visiting Team.</li><li>• It’s affirming to hear from an external team how we are working together. That we live the words that were shared in the ISER. That we displayed integrity.</li><li>• The very positive comments during the Exit Report reflect the many people involved in the process over the years. The Team saw affirmation for what they read when visiting the campus. We stuck to the theme, and it showed when they visited, weaving our story.</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--

- We showed them how we do things. Congratulations are in order, for the entire team, especially the core team.
- It resonated that we work well together.
- **Core Inquiry One - Evaluations:**

**Mt. SAC Employee Evaluation  
Completion February 2024**

Table 1. Number of employees who have been evaluated in a timely manner and/or Per CBA Timelines

Employee Group	Complete	Incomplete	Total	% Evaluated
Adjunct Faculty	1072	271	1343 *	80%
Classified 262	493	116	609	81%
Classified 651	32	80	112	29%
Confidential	10	7	17	59%
Full Time Faculty	421	33	454 +	93%
Management	135	5	140	96%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2163</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>2675</b>	<b>81%</b>

Overall, 81% of all Mt. SAC employees have been evaluated in a timely manner and/or per CBA timelines.

\* An additional 152 adjunct faculty have not yet completed a full evaluation cycle and are not included in the adjunct total count.

+ An additional 2 full time faculty have not yet completed a full evaluation cycle and are not included in the adjunct total count.

- HR was able to share their plan for hiring someone to track this process and software to help with it as well. You can see that all areas have improved and CSEA 651 signed an MOU so that we can get caught up. HR is in BETA testing for implementing a new system, which is designed to track and follow the process all the way through.
- They hope to implement it at the end of this semester. HR will assist with the tracking; however, the divisions will still process the evaluations.
- There is a plan for training the divisions and the campus so that the rollout of the new software is as smooth as possible. This will also help with consistency across divisions.
- **Core Inquiry 2 – Shared Governance:** Observed renewed commitment. Collegial nudging from

		<p>Senate. A handbook I being crated b a workgroup from PAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Core Inquiry 3 – BP/AP Review and Revision Cycle:</b> The document is in the most recent PAC notes. There is also a cycle.</li><li>• I’m glad that they also added some suggestions to track data. There are so many APs/BPs. If we can show how the updated AP/BPs affect our work it would be great in helping others understand the changes and how they affect their daily work as well.</li><li>• Sara Mestas has done a great job. However, we need some LHE to support this ongoing work.</li><li>• <b>Coire Inquiry 4 – RSI:</b> They let us know that this is an area which we need focused dedicated improvements in the coming months. We expect a recommendation for this inquiry. Those colleges struggling with RSI have been given 18 months to make improvements.</li><li>• The Team found minimal substantive feedback on assignments. They noted work has begun in this area.</li><li>• If we get a recommendation for RSI. When they come back, they will pull more random classes and review them. A certain percentage and up to 50 online classes can be reviewed.</li><li>• Faculty who were early in adopting RSI, have challenges with RSI.</li><li>• Teachers do a lot of communication with students on platforms that are not on Canvas. This RSI is not getting captured.</li><li>• Then others don’t understand what RSI is.</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Team said they had raised concerns. This is not good when we are increasing the online classes being offered.</li><li>• 18 months really gives us a year, to show improvement, before they pull additional courses.</li><li>• If they don't see what they need to see with compliance, we will move to sanction. Which would be very difficult for us and our students.</li><li>• FCLT has been working on different ways to get the information to faculty, like workshops.</li><li>• The work done by the DLC has us in a good position to respond to this inquiry.</li><li>• It would be helpful to have data on which groups are not doing RSI. Is it those who first started teaching OL classes? Is it PT faculty? Is it those who recently went through SPOT training? We need to keep everyone anonymous, but knowing which groups need the training the most would help.</li><li>• It's a good idea to look at data to guide us through which groups need it the most.</li><li>• We have some great processes in place. This is something that all of us want to improve. I'm sure we will work this out and improve in this area.</li><li>• Moreno Valley did some things with peers and mentors. Some other colleges had some best practices in place as well. The lead on this needs to come from the Senate.</li><li>• GRASP and LEED were reviewed for accommodation.</li><li>• <b>Accreditation Process Feedback Survey</b> – It's still online and live.</li><li>• We have not sent it out since the Fall, but we didn't get a lot of responses. We can check to see what</li></ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>the responses are and then go from there. It would be interesting to know how many people were following the ISER, are they aware of the exit report? Questions like this would be interesting.</p>	
5.	Annual Report (Kelly/Patty)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institution-Set Standards</li> <li>• We submit data to ACCJC every year.</li> <li>• We report on student outcomes. Licensure and pass rates. That report is due April 19th.</li> <li>• We plan to share all those numbers here on ASC.</li> </ul>	
6.	Information Items (Kelly)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long Island Business Institute Accreditation withdrawal (email 1/29) - (<a href="#">January 2024 Executive Committee Actions</a> and <a href="#">January 2024 Actions</a>)</li> <li>• Distance Education Approval (email 1/30) – (<a href="#">Policy on Substantive Change</a> and <a href="#">Substantive Change Manual, Letter on Accreditation and Eligibility Requirements for Distance Education</a>)</li> <li>• Annual Report Survey (email 2/14)</li> <li>• Histotechnology BA Update – We have been developing a new BA, the target launch date is Fall 2025. We must plan enough time for our college to submit.</li> <li>• CBE Update – Tabling for next meeting.</li> </ul>	
7.	SCE Update (Minerva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board of Trustees approved the report, which is accessible online.</li> <li>• We are finalizing the action plan that we will submit as part of our self-study.</li> <li>• The first one is online student support services. Another area was data analysis. Establishing a culture that is rich in data. Then DEISA+ tracking the effect of that. It is very much a faculty driven process.</li> <li>• We spoke to the chair, and they provided us more guidance.</li> </ul>	

8.	Questions and Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSI? – Regular Substantive Interaction.</li> <li>• A new federal regulation that was released in 2022 implemented RSI goals.</li> <li>• There are now new accreditation standards that we will need to review and learn about.</li> <li>• Big kudos to the whole Outcomes team, we didn't get any inquiries on Outcomes.</li> </ul>	
9.	Thank you!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thank you, everyone, for their hard work!</li> </ul>	
<b>Parking Lot/Upcoming Topics:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmatic accreditations</li> <li>• Implementation of the QFE</li> <li>• New 2024 Standards</li> </ul>		<b>Future meetings:</b> April 5 <sup>th</sup> , May 3 <sup>rd</sup> , and June 7 <sup>th</sup> .	<b>Standing Information:</b> <a href="#">Accreditation Website</a> <a href="#">Acronym List</a>