



## Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 1, 2022

3 - 5 PM, Virtual Meeting

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/9055741625>

### MINUTES

**Members Present:** Kristin Charles (Co-Chair), Sheri Miraglia (Co-Chair), Andrea Niosi, Cynthia Dewar, Steven Brown, Chris Brodie, Darieus Rego; **Alternates Present:** Madeline Mueller, Judy Seto

**Members Absent:** Vinicio Lopez, Victoria Tan

**Alternates Absent:** Joseph Reyes, Lidia Jenkins, Michael Snider, Maria Salazar-Colon

**Guest:** Alexis Litzky

No.	Item	Discussion/Outcome	Follow Up/ Individual Responsible
1.	Approval of <a href="#">December 7, 2021</a> Minutes	Approval of December 7th minutes moved by Sheri Miraglia, seconded by Andrea Niosi, unanimously approved by committee with no abstentions.	
2.	Follow-up items from last meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation Steering Committee membership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Student</li> </ul> </li> <li>Update on <a href="#">proposed BP/AP review process</a></li> <li>Update on syllabi/SLOs to continue to work towards finding a more sustainable solution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation Steering Committee membership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ We still need one more student member.</li> <li>✓ There are also open seats for 3 student alternates. Amy Coffey of Student Activities is aware of it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Update on proposed BP/AP review process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The Cabinet Leads met a couple of times to work on the BPs/APs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Update on syllabi/SLOs to continue to work towards finding a more sustainable solution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Cynthia Dewar is working on solutions with her team related to this.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Accreditation Committee will continue to discuss syllabi/SLOs until we find a more sustainable solution.

3.	<p>Update on Fall 2023 Self Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Timeline</a></li> <li>• Status of Accreditation ISER Team Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are very close to completing all the standards for the initial drafts.</li> <li>• Some teams are lagging a little, but the Team Leads are tying up loose ends.</li> <li>• After reviewing the initial draft, Kristin/Sheri will give the Standard Teams more guidance on next steps.</li> </ul>	
4.	<p>Sheri and Kristin share their findings on Standard IA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Standard IA ISER Team Report</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Standard IA1 review</a></li> </ul> <p>Focus on the remainder in breakout groups (see <a href="#">assignment</a>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Standard IA2 review</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Standard IA3 review</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Standard IA4 review</a></li> </ul>	<p>Kristin walked through the process with the committee to review the initial draft for the standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheri/Kristin took the first pass on reviewing the standards.</li> <li>• They assessed if the evidence speaks to the standard. Is it complete, appropriate, and clear?</li> <li>• Both crafted and compared their analyses on Standard IA and created the feedback form.</li> <li>• At the last meeting, we agreed to walk through Standard IIID (Finance) as a demo in reviewing the standards, given that we are struggling the most in this area. It was not yet ready for reviewing, so Sheri/Kristin used Standard IA instead. As with all Standards, we will discuss areas where we have concerns with the committee.</li> <li>• Kristin reviewed the format and content of Standard IA1 ISER Team Report as an example of how we would review the standard. Then she walked through the review feedback form that she and Sheri prepared with the committee to see if there were any questions.</li> <li>• Committee members joined breakout rooms (3 groups) to review the remaining subsections of Standard I (IA2, IA3, and IA4):</li> <li>• The assignment was to review the subsection assigned to the group within the draft Standard IA ISER team response</li> <li>• Look at the evidence to determine if it's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ organized/flows according to the Standard (each element is addressed in the order it appears in the subsection)</li> <li>○ appropriate, speaks to the Standard and doesn't exceed the scope of the Standard</li> <li>○ sufficient, no missing evidence</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Use the <a href="#">Guide to Institutional Self Evaluation</a> for possible evidence.</li> <li>• Look at the Analysis and Evaluation section to see if it:</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ is organized/flows according to the Standard (each element is addressed in the order it appears in the subsection)</li> <li>○ speaks to the Standard</li> <li>○ utilizes language from the Standard</li> <li>○ doesn't exceed the scope of the Standard</li> <li>○ is based on the evidence</li> <li>○ is clear and to the point</li> <li>○ someone less well-versed in the content area of the Standard can understand the conclusions</li> <li>○ is believable/substantiated by the evidence</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Compare the groups' reviews with Sheri/Kristin's findings on the feedback forms for Standard IA2, IA3, and IA4 that is embedded within this meeting agenda to see if the group agreed.</li> </ul>	
5.	<p>Walk through Accreditation Steering Committee Member review process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Discuss rubric/<a href="#">feedback form</a> for reviewing the Standards</li> <li>● <a href="#">Accreditation Steering Committee ISER Review - Standards Assignment</a></li> </ul> <p>Timeline for completing this work / next steps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Kristin shared and discussed the feedback form that Steering Committee members will use in reviewing the Standards.</li> <li>● Each committee member is assigned to a Standard for review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The review process will be the same as we did in the breakout room.</li> <li>○ Read each subsection, review the evidence, and fill out the feedback form.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Timeline for completing this work/next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kristin/Sheri are close to finalizing the review of the Standards.</li> <li>○ They will send it to the Team Lead and Accreditation Steering Committee soon.</li> <li>○ Kristin will send the assignment with the relevant documents of the Standard that is assigned to each Accreditation Steering Committee member.</li> <li>○ By the next Steering Committee meeting, Kristin/Sheri will share any challenges from the Standards.</li> <li>○ Kristin/Sheri will also collect any additional feedback from the committee members for the Team Leads.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ By May 2022, Team Leads should have completed their final review.</li> <li>○ Between March/April 2022, Kristin will be working on the Eligibility Requirements and ACCJC Policies.</li> </ul>	
6.	Update on Quality Focus Essay (QFE)	Conversation has begun, Kristin/Sheri will provide more updates later.	
7.	Other Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Kevin Bontenbal is our ACCJC staff liaison. He offered to meet with anyone in the College. Kristin will touch base with Sheri on this.</li> <li>● Our next meeting is on March 1<sup>st</sup> which is a Flex Day. We will reschedule it to March 8<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>	

#### **Upcoming Meeting Dates for Spring 2022:**

March 8: 3-5 pm

April 5: 3-5 pm

May 3: 3-5 pm

Minutes taken by Judy Seto