



MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE ■ ACCREDITATION STEERING COMMITTEE ■ AGENDA

DECEMBER 1, 2023
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"/> TANIA ANDERS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ROSA ASENCIO, CSEA 262 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MINERVA AVILA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MICHAEL CARR |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MEGHAN CHEN | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KELLY COREAS | <input type="checkbox"/> TIKA DAVE´-HARRIS | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> BETA MEYER | <input type="checkbox"/> ROBERT MONTOYA, CSEA 651 | <input type="checkbox"/> PATRICIA QUINONES | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MARYAM QURESHI |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L R RODRIGUEZ | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MICHELLE SHEAR | <input type="checkbox"/> KOJI UESUGI | | | |
| <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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
2.	Agenda Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed 	
3.	Review of November 3rd , Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve minutes, A. Frickert, second by M. Carr, Minutes approved with one abstention. 	
4.	Updated Purpose & Function , and Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Purpose & Function as well as the Goals have been submitted to the President’s Office. • We will revisit these in the Spring. 	
5.	Core Inquiry Team Announced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr. Matthew Wetstein, Chair - Dr. Pedro Avila, Vice Chair - Dr. Linda Carvalho Cooley, Professor - Mr. Ulises Velasco, VP Student Services - Dr. Gohar Momjian, VP ACCJC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Team will interview and finalize the report. • They will only speak to areas that they have questions about. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The accommodations are for Student Services. • The Team was thirteen members and is now down to four members, who will visit campus. • We will give them another smaller report before they visit. 	
6.	Progress on ACCJC Core Inquiries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a limited opportunity to provide them with more information. • The College is given 300 words per inquiry additional evidence or documents can also be attached. • It's very simplified, each inquiry has the same format. • It's a very tight turnaround with the holidays. • Inquiry 1: Evaluations - Focus a lot on what will go in the data. • The data needs to be updated. Some areas like CSEA 651 will not move much since there is language in their contract that an evaluation cannot be completed after a certain amount of time has passed. • CESA 262 managers will most likely try to get the evaluations completed. • HR moved to PeopleSoft which will allow us to see our evaluation go through the process. • We'll talk to HR about reformatting the information. • Inquiry 2: Governance Structure - the workgroup has tri-chairs. • The main goal will be to work on a handbook. • We should at least have an outline and work on the draft in February and March. • Most handbooks that we have seen from other colleges, are around seventy pages. • The AP is limited, the handbook needs to give all the details to ensure that we are working well together. • This will allow for the details to live in the handbook and not bog down the AP or BP. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you think of things that need to go in the handbook, please contact someone in this workgroup. • Inquiry 3: AP & BP Review - The workgroup created by PAC will be convening. There is an AP on how to review APs and BPs. • We identified this as an area of improvement ourselves. • The workgroup will convene and start reviewing the APs and BPs. • We will start a cycle for review. The workgroup is trying to put communication structures in place. • Who initiates? who shepherds it through the process? We need to figure out the workflow. • Inquiry 4: RSI – The faculty visitor is one of those who reviewed the ISER. • An additional randomly selected 50 courses will be pulled and provided to the inquiry team. • A test by faculty members on the committee will be conducted, they will look at each other’s courses to see what the team might see. • The RSI rubric is a self-evaluation tool that is used to make sure that faculty have RSI in their course. • We are working on negotiating what system to put in place. • Essentially, we are hopeful that this new set of courses will represent our online courses accurately. • The visiting team will be given teacher access. • We may have to pull courses that are child courses. • If three courses are merged in Canvas, we would only see the parent course. • The canvas merge is only visible when you look at individuals, otherwise you will only see the parent shell. • If the child course is included, that’s okay. This is our process. We can give the team a heads-up about this by providing them with instructions. • Inquiry 5: GRASP & LEAD. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible Accommodation. • We are in a good place for this inquiry. 	
7.	Commission Action Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visiting team will leave us with a really good idea of what will happen. • The four team members visiting will add the visit information to the larger report. • This information is then given to the commission, and they make the final decision. • Some colleges have gotten recommendations and reaffirmed with 18 months follow-up. • Several other colleges have struggled in the same areas as our inquiries. • If the commission follows what has happened to other colleges, we will have a follow-up in 18 months. • That doesn't mean that this will happen however this is the commission's pattern. • RSI is a new policy, we will have a sustainable system in place, but it will take time for everyone to go through the training. • We've made a shift to set us up for success to show we are doing this now. • It's a tight turnaround time for the RSI training, especially since the RSI rubric needs to be negotiated. 	
8.	Communication with Constituencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you need to share this information and possible ACCJC actions with your constituencies? • What do your constituencies need ASC to provide? • Everyone here needs to be prepared to speak to the visiting team. They did ask to speak to ASC committee members. • One of the biggest challenges is communication. • We want people to feel confident and prepared for the visit. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication from Instruction to faculty stating what needs to be done for the visiting team. If it's been negotiated include the RSI rubric. • The visit is the week after Flex Day. • There's a sense of urgency. It's important that this is a collaborative effort. • B. Meyer and T Anders will work on a draft email. • 	
9.	ASC Preparation for the Visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you need to feel comfortable for possible interviews? • Add a special Meeting in February 2024? 	
10.	Programmatic Accreditations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabled until the next meeting. 	
11.	Resource: Acronym List (Lianne)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabled until the next meeting. 	
12.	SCE Update (Minerva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabled until the next meeting. 	
13.	Questions and Announcements		
14.	Thank you!		
Parking Lot/Upcoming Topics:		Future meetings: March 1 st , April 5 th , May 3 rd , June 7 th .	Standing Information: Accreditation Website Acronym List