MEMBERSHIP

	KELLY FOWLER, CO-CHAIR	X	BARBARA MEZAKI, CO-CHAIR	X	MINERVA AVILA	X	VALERIE BILLER, CSEA 262	X	MICHAEL CARR	X	MEGHAN CHEN
X	KELLY COREAS	X	TIKA DAVE´-HARRIS		DIANA DZIB	X	PENNY PEIYING FENG		L.E. FOISIA	X	ALLIE FRICKERT
	LIANNE MALDONADO-GREENLEE		BETA MEYER		ROBERT MONTOYA, CSEA 651	X	PATRICIA QUINONES		L R RODRIGUEZ	X	MICHELLE SHEAR
	KOJI UESUGI		VACANT, STUDENT	X	TANIA ANDERS						

	MICHELLE SAMPAT (GUEST)		CATHY STUTE (GUEST)	X	CHRISTINA KESSLER	X	*WENDI ALCAZAR, RECORDER*

	TOPIC	UPDATES/DISCUSSION	OUTCOME/ACTION
1.	Welcome	•	
2.	Agenda Review	• Remove SCE report Minerva is already reporting. Agenda reviewed and approved.	
3.	Review of April 5th, Minutes	• Reviewed, motion to approve minutes made by M. Avila, second made by A. Frickert, approved.	Approved.
4.	ACS WASC Update (Minerva)	• The team visit was 4/22/24-4/24/24. Two days prior to the visit the team asked for 41 additional pieces of evidence. This was our first virtual visit. We have two managers who were part of a visiting team who did virtual visits, so this was very useful. Lapel microphones were used to help with audio, they visited 65 classrooms, four groups with iPads assisted with the virtual tour. We went into welding, etc. It went well. We had to make a couple of changes as far as logistics was concerned. But meeting with the team turned out well. There were also 4 groups of SCE employees that met with them as well. The Visiting Team will share their report,	

		which we will be able to make minor changes or edits to. The report then goes to the governing board. There are advantages to virtual but neither on site visit nor virtual is necessarily better.	
		• The outcome of the visit could put SCE in a 6-year cycle with a visit in the middle or fewer years.	
		• In preparation for the visit SCE sent out a Q&A to faculty about what to expect during the virtual visit in their classroom. Also, some prerecorded class sessions for classes that were not in session at the time of the visit was done. The classroom visits were only 10 minutes and went well.	
		• 5-years from now we will be gearing up to assist SCE with their visit again.	
5.	Focus on RSI	• We can timeline and anticipate that a recommendation for RSI was 18-month follow up or report or possibly both. We believe that we will have 50 more courses pulled to check RSI.	
		• Anticipated Timeline (18 Month report and revisit)	
		▪ June 2024 Commission Decision, we should receive the report by the end of June.	
		▪ Summer 2024/Fall 2024 - RSI Implementation Efforts.	
		▪ Spring 2025 - 50 random courses pulled for RSI review by the Visiting Team.	
		▪ October 2025 - Report and possibly a visit.	
		• Possible outcomes if RSI is not validated during October 2025 Visit. They could ask us to do 50 more courses or put us on warning. We don't believe that this will happen.	
		• Communication to Campus	
		▪ Discuss Possible Next Steps (e.g. Friday Forum, Infographics, etc.)	
		▪ Summer: How to communicate Commission decision? Planning for Support?	

Sharing Our Story

- Based on the commissions exit report we have an idea of what the report will say however we don't want to make decisions prematurely.
- Planning for Support
  - Academic Senate RSI Taskforce Recommendations.
  - Faculty started meeting right after our exit report and started to research how other colleges are handling RSI.
  - DL Handbook Development/Alignment with new ACCJC Standards.
  - This will include using the RSI rubric. This is a common recommendation. We are lucky other colleges have gone through this before us, we can use their examples.
  - The peer-to-peer mentor was successful.
  - They used head coaches that worked with individuals. Moreno Valley has faculty trainers.
- We recommended a two-phase process.
- The immediate addressing of the RSI deficiencies.
  - We need to launch something right away over the summer extending through the Spring 2025.
  - We will have an RSI coordinator that will coordinate a team, and review 450 courses. We broke out the LHE and hours needed as well as a one-time stipend for this position.
  - We have also asked that the coordinator be institutionalized.
- Campus outreach: Thursday May 16th at 3pm we will have a town hall geared towards faculty to share the plans for RSI. This will be a time to educate and share information. We will do this in the Spring and Fall.
  - In the Fall we will have an opportunity to showcase best practices.
  - Dr. Garcia has supported the requests. Right now, it looks like we will have one RSI Coordinator. It will depend on the need. Sometimes we have 100 people needing

| | | assistance other times we have several hundred. | |
| | | This will assist with the workload that is currently on the SPOT coordinators which is a lot of work on top of their regular duties right now. In Spring the RSI Coordinator will support the accreditation process. Including, alignment of RSI Definitions with ACCJC, federal, and state definitions in all College documents (ex. AP 4105, DL Handbook, FA contract 13.A.3). What is success going to look like? This has a lot to do with student success. The better we communicate with my students the more likely they are going to succeed. Can our communication be about why we are really doing this? We are doing this for student success. At the ASCCC Spring Plenary Kelly Rivera put forward a resolution to make sure that RSI is a faculty matter. Reviewing and providing feedback should be handled by faculty. This was also put through as a local measure and went through the Senate with flying colors. We have also submitted an Appendix E addition for the RSI Coordinators. Two positions the first year then one the following years. The final document was submitted today. We have been attempting the share the RSI Rubric through Shared Governance. The Rubric is a tool for faculty to do a self-evaluation of their own work. This is to ensure that the faculty have regular interaction with their students. All the work we have been doing over the last two years is coming into fruition. Hopefully this will help us roll out best practices and get us sharing and out of our silos. | |

Sharing Our Story

		• We can really use the RSI issue to springboard and help with other areas. • Learning to teach online impacted how faculty teach in person. They took the tools and used them for all their students. • It's shocking that not all universities or colleges require training for online courses. • We're in a good place because we have rigorous training for faculty. • Dr. Garcia was very supportive of the faculty plan. She supports us improving ourselves. • We have so many technology tools at Mt. SAC. The college pays for all of these, and they are tools that we should use for all our classes. • We should open the communications and training for all instructors whether they teach online of not. These tools could be beneficial to in-person classes as well. These tools enhance the student's experience.	
6.	ASC Goals Progress	• Review of Goals and Outcomes.	
7.	ISER Process Survey Results Discussion	Default Report *ISER Progress Feedback Survey* April 29th 2024, 9:10 am PDT **What is your role at Mt. SAC?** | #	Answer	%	Count
1	Adjunct Faculty	4.84%	3
2	Full-time Faculty	41.94%	26
3	Classified Professional	17.74%	11
4	Short-term Employee	1.61%	1
5	Manager/Administrator	24.19%	15
6	Board Member	1.61%	1
7	Student	4.84%	3
8	Other	3.23%	2
	Total	100%	62		

Please indicate if you were involved in one of the following teams/committee: Weaving Team, Finishing Team or Resource Committee.

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	38.71%	24
2	No	61.29%	38
	Total	100%	62

Please indicate which team/committee you were a part of (select all that apply).

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Weaving Team	44.12%	15
2	Finishing Team	47.06%	16
3	Resource Committee	8.82%	3
	Total	100%	34

Please share what worked well during the accreditation process that supported your role.

Check-in meetings

The structure was extremely valuable. Included in that is the makeup of the team and assignments. Another thing that was very well thought out and executed was the identification of where the gaps in available evidence were and a process to locate needed evidence.

Employing subgroups for the weaving teams so the workload was distributed. Having a manager that was involved in the process as well.

Good faculty coordination from Barbara.

Leadership and guidance from the liaisons who were always very responsive, patient, and helpful.

Good communication and support with Faculty Accreditation Coordinators

well disseminated drafts, and using online resources to gather information and documentation/ links

Communication with Core Team for support and responding to questions. Allie and Barbara were particularly helpful. Creating a shared drive for the documents was also very helpful.

Having a resource person from the core team.

Meeting updates

Offer some suggestions to revise the ISER draft

Having clear guidance, specific feedback, and responsive support from the core team has been tremendously helpful.

Facilitation by the Accreditation Team leaders throughout the process was very helpful.

Having good communication was key.

Awesome and supportive core team. Always ready to help when I encountered a stumbling block. It was truly a team effort. Realistic timelines were helpful too.

Organized meetings and material to review/update.

Sharing Our Story

The structure was extremely valuable. Included in that is the makeup of the team and assignments. Another thing that was very well thought out and executed was the identification of where the gaps in available evidence were and a process to locate needed evidence.

Employing subgroups for the weaving teams so the workload was distributed. Having a manager that was involved in the process as well.

Good faculty coordination from Barbara.

Leadership and guidance from the liaisons who were always very responsive, patient, and helpful.

Good communication and support with Faculty Accreditation Coordinators

well disseminated drafts, and using online resources to gather information and documentation/ links

Communication with Core Team for support and responding to questions. Allie and Barbara were particularly helpful. Creating a shared drive for the documents was also very helpful.

Having a resource person from the core team.

Meeting updates

Offer some suggestions to revise the ISER draft

Having clear guidance, specific feedback, and responsive support from the core team has been tremendously helpful.

Facilitation by the Accreditation Team leaders throughout the process was very helpful.

Having good communication was key.

Awesome and supportive core team. Always ready to help when I encountered a stumbling block. It was truly a team effort. Realistic timelines were helpful too.

Organized meetings and material to review/update.

It was great to have the meetings to discuss the drafts with the chairs and co-chairs.

Guidance from Core Team

The entire process was well managed and organized!

Please share any challenges you experienced that made the accreditation process difficult.

Please share any challenges you experienced that made the accreditation process difficult.

None

Steep learning curve

locating evidence; I feel that collecting evidence should be part of an annual report. It is (comparatively) very hard to remember or find current evidence retroactively.

NA

Found the finishing teams redundant

None

Understanding the ISER process and content is a great challenge I experienced.

The groups I was a part of provided very little work, and it was frustrating. The one or two people in my group had to do the bulk of the work throughout a lengthy period.

None

It was a lot of work that I was not completely prepared for but the supportive Core Team was very understanding

Learning material, but everyone was very helpful when I had questions.

In addition to your involvement on the team/committee, how else did you receive information about the accreditation process and activities? (select all that apply)

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Campus Emails	46.34%	19
2	Hot Pink Sheets	4.88%	2
3	Colleague/Co-workers	29.27%	12
4	Manager/supervisor	19.51%	8
	Total	100%	41

Please indicate if you were involved or participated in the following accreditation process activities (select all that apply). *ISER = Institutional Self-Evaluation Report

#	Question	Participated		Did not participate		Total
1	ISER feedback listening session	76.47%	13	23.53%	4	17
2	Accreditation presentation (e.g., Flex Day, Friday Forum, CPF Day, Information session to your employee group)	80.00%	12	20.00%	3	15

Please indicate your level of awareness for the following statements. I am aware:

#	Question	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Opinion		Total
1	There was is accreditation website	83.33%	15	16.67%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	18
2	An ISER draft was available online for me to access	83.33%	15	16.67%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	18
3	I could provide feedback to the Accreditation Steering committee about the accreditation process	72.22%	13	22.22%	4	5.56%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	18
4	I could provide feedback to the Accreditation Steering committee about documents	77.78%	14	16.67%	3	5.56%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	18

- How can we use this information to improve processes this relates to?
- Perhaps we can send out a survey in Winter to find out what faculty know about RSI before and after the training.
- Can we have a survey about best practices? Can we use these practices and help them scale?
- Targeted polls might get a better response than the more general polls.
- Perhaps we close out the weaving or finishing team work, by having them complete the survey.

8.	ACCJC Conference – Poster Session Presentation	• Poster presentation at the ACCJC conference is next week. • It's about us weaving our story.	
9.	Homework: Become familiar with 2024 Standards and Accreditation Handbook	•	
10.	~~SCE Update (Minerva)~~	• Removed from agenda. Topics are covered in the WASC update.	
11.	Questions and Announcements	•	

Sharing Our Story

12.	Thank you!	●	
Parking Lot/Upcoming Topics: ● None	**Future meetings**: June 7th.		**Standing Information:** Accreditation Website Acronym List