



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

**NOVEMBER 3, 2023**  
**10:30A-12:00P – ZOOM**

**MEMBERSHIP**

- |   |  |   |  |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KELLY FOWLER, CO-CHAIR    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BARBARA MEZAKI, CO-CHAIR | <input type="checkbox"/> ROSA ASENCIO             | <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> PATRICIA QUINONES  | <input type="checkbox"/> L R RODRIGUEZ           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MICHELLE SHEAR          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KOJI UESUGI               | <input type="checkbox"/> VACANT, STUDENT                     | <input type="checkbox"/> ROGER WILLIS             |  |  |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MICHELLE SAMPAT (GUEST)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CATHY STUTE (GUEST)      | MARYAM QURESHI                                    |  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WENDI ALCAZAR, RECORDER |

	TOPIC	UPDATES/DISCUSSION	OUTCOME/ACTION
1.	Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congratulations to Penny! Student Legacy Leader winner!</li> </ul>	
2.	Agenda Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed</li> </ul>	
3.	Review of <a href="#">October 6<sup>th</sup></a> , Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed, a motion to approve the minutes made by P. Quinones, second K. Uesugi. Motion approved.</li> </ul>	
4.	<a href="#">Purpose and Function</a> , and <a href="#">Goals</a> Review (2022-2023 working versions) (Allie and Barbara)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read aloud for review. No comma after WASC.</li> <li>• Membership: 7. needs to be updated to Minerva Avila.</li> <li>• 9. Change name to Koji Uesugi not Tom Mauch 23-26</li> <li>• Students need to be worked out and update the terms.</li> <li>• 19. change the first name to Kelly, not Kim.</li> <li>• Goals:</li> <li>• Remove #6 - duplicate.</li> <li>• #4 We are no longer developing the ISER, to implement the QFE and core inquiries.</li> <li>• If we remove the ACCJC standards, we will not have to work on it if we don't get to it.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• February would be a better time to see if we can get to this.</li> <li>• If we leave it we can use it for both the old and new.</li> <li>• We should take out the ISER.</li> <li>• We could use the ISER as a goal 6.</li> <li>• Goal 4 remove ISER and make the ISER Goal 6. Review ACCJC standards.</li> <li>• Review ACCJC standards. Align and collaborate with committees and councils to ensure alignment.</li> <li>• Leave the first sentence, remove the part about the ISER, "...to support the development of the ISER."</li> <li>• The overarching idea is to meet the standards.</li> <li>• If we keep the first sentence it covers what we are discussing.</li> <li>• We received a lot of feedback that we need to work on.</li> <li>• Remove the second sentence from Goal 4.</li> </ul>	
5.	Accreditation Forum Debrief (Allie and Barbara)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to all who attended the forums. Does anyone have thoughts they would like to share?</li> <li>• There were two sessions facilitated by the Visiting Team. They did very well.</li> <li>• Public safety is not an ACCJC standard. Maybe it should be. But all the safety is about facilities. However, safety is part of our mission.</li> <li>• Shared governance roles. Our processes are not always followed. It is part of our improvement plan.</li> <li>• The team was very complimentary of our attempts to get diversified broad participation with regards to the ISER.</li> <li>• It seemed positive, not punitive. They just wanted to know what was going on, on our campus.</li> <li>• The FA is concerned about following what our Board Policies and Administrative Procedures say. This came up in the meeting.</li> <li>• We can all come together in the end and say we have a great job.</li> <li>• What was the participation like? And representation? The first forum was widely attended</li> </ul>	

		<p>by the staff the second had less staff. There were 60-70 attendees at the two forums combined, not counting the standard attendees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We had high participation of classified on the weaving teams, finishing teams, and resource teams.</li> <li>• They used the forum as a listening opportunity.</li> </ul>	
6.	<a href="#">ACCJC Core Inquiries</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Visiting Team reached out to about 20 different areas in which they wanted additional evidence.</li> <li>• An inquiry does not mean that we are out of compliance.</li> <li>• Outcomes did great, they are not included in the inquiry. There were some changes and work done before the current coordinators took over.</li> <li>• The core team has met and identified people or groups that we will reach out to for assistance in completing our response to the inquiries.</li> <li>• Inquiry 1: The percentages are listed under the description. We need to break down this data and tell a story about the numbers.</li> <li>• Topics: Discuss what they want to see in their visit.</li> <li>• There is an MOU that during the pandemic we didn't have to submit the year two evaluations for faculty. This may have affected our numbers.</li> <li>• The table of data submitted was a bit ambiguous. So, we just need to tell our story better.</li> <li>• These are not meant to be punitive.</li> <li>• Inquiry 2: About our governance structure. R. Willis has suggested we need a handbook for governance. PAC has already started work on this.</li> <li>• This is another item that enforces our hunches and that we need to be better.</li> <li>• Inquiry 3: AP/BP review - How can we make this process better? We are looking at creating a workgroup to work on this.</li> <li>• Again, this is an area of improvement.</li> <li>• Inquiry 4: Distance education with RSI. Research pulled data and we gave them additional data.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have discussed pulling from different workgroups to improve this and pull together additional evidence for the review team.</li> <li>• RSI upscaling and how that may look. SPOT certification may need to be updated. There is an RSI form that is going back on the Academic Senate agenda for review.</li> <li>• Leveraging this to improve is the whole purpose of the inquiries.</li> <li>• The Senate is looking at a lot of these processes and updating them as needed.</li> <li>• Another sample of classes from the Fall may provide evidence of RSI.</li> <li>• Some of the interactions with students in online classes are not visible due to other technologies being used.</li> <li>• This is something that we can't show the ACCJC team.</li> <li>• ACCJC only looks at what is in the shell on Canvas.</li> <li>• Institutionalized certification will include RSI.</li> <li>• Inquiry 5: is an accommodation for student support services.</li> </ul>	
7.	Accreditation Process (Kelly)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible <a href="#">ACCJC actions</a> in June 2024.</li> <li>• Area III: The first level of our status is reaffirming our accreditation. This would be dreamy.</li> <li>• Reaffirm with a follow-up – means we're close but have a little to clean up.</li> <li>• Reaffirm Accreditation for 18 months – requires a follow-up report.</li> <li>• Any of these three is probably an outcome we will have. It just depends on the team and the commission and what they are looking for.</li> <li>• The commission will make the final determination.</li> <li>• Probation is unlikely.</li> <li>• They were impressed with our diverse inclusion of everyone who worked on our ISER.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It took a lot of people to get us to where we are today.</li> <li>• We have been looking at trends and how the commission works. Some colleges had to improve their evaluation process. If we have a plan in place that may determine if we improve in this area as well. Other colleges are struggling with this as well, especially since the pandemic.</li> <li>• We believe that we are close, but some areas do need improvement, so we may get a follow-up.</li> <li>• The team brought us together in a way that we had not come together before, we told the story repeatedly, in a way that we pulled together.</li> </ul>	
8.	Programmatic Accreditations (Lianne)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postponed until the next meeting.</li> </ul>	
9.	Resource: <a href="#">Acronym List</a> (Lianne)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postponed until the next meeting.</li> </ul>	
10.	SCE Update (Minerva)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We requested a virtual visit, and it has been granted.</li> <li>• A virtual visit will require more work upfront but hopefully the visit will be a little less stressful.</li> <li>• We have a manager who will be conducting a virtual review so we will be able to get some insight into the process and what they will be looking for after their visit is complete.</li> </ul>	
11.	Questions and Announcements		
12.	Thank you!		
<b>Parking Lot/Upcoming Topics:</b>		<b>Future meetings:</b> December 1 <sup>st</sup> , March 1 <sup>st</sup> , April 5 <sup>th</sup> , May 3 <sup>rd</sup> , June 7 <sup>th</sup> .	<b>Standing Information:</b> <a href="#">Accreditation Website</a> <a href="#">Acronym List</a>