

Mt. San Antonio College Accreditation Steering Committee

Agenda | Minutes
September 4, 2020
10:30am-12:00pm
Zoom Meeting

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| X | Rocio Avila (Co-Chair) | X | Diana Dzib (Classified senate) | X | Barbara McNeice Stallard (Director, RIE) | | Student Rep (vacant) |
| X | Richard Mahon (Co-Chair) | X | Lianne Greenlee (Director, POD) | X | Beta Meyer (FA appointee) | | Faculty Accreditation Coordinator (vacant) |
| X | Ron Bean (Management, Admin Services) | X | Audrey Yamagata-Noji (Management, Student Services) | | Loni Nguyen (Outcomes Coordinator) | | Faculty (vacant) |
| X | Liza Becker (SCE) | X | Diondre Mc Bride (CSEA 651) | X | Robert Stubbe (CSEA 62) | | Faculty, NC (vacant) |
| | Alexis Carter (Management, HR) | | Joumana McGowan (AVP, Instruction) | X | Chisa Uyeki (Senate President) | x | Kristina Allende (Guest) |

| Topic | Time | Discussion | Action Item |
|--|-------|--|-------------|
| 1. Welcome | 10:30 | | |
| 2. Approval of the Agenda | 10:30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rocio asked to move Topic 5 to after Topic 9. Item 9 to be discussed at the October 2 meeting. Item 7 to be discussed at the October 2 meeting, but not beyond that. | |
| 3. Approval of the June 5 minutes | 10:35 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard to send Lisa the corrections. Minutes approved as submitted with the noted corrections. | |
| 4. Announcements | 10:35 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard to send email from ACCJC with information regarding some upcoming seminars. | |
| 5. Purpose, Function, and Membership (2019-2020) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved by PAC (Chisa) 2019-20 Goals – What did we accomplish (Richard) 2020-2021 Possible Edits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose and Function (Barbara) Update membership and Terms (Lisa) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Co-Chair (Chisa) Goals (Richard) | 10:40 | To be discussed at 10/2 meeting | |
| 6. Accreditation Midterm Report (Rocio) | 10:50 | Rocio reported the following regarding the Accreditation Midterm Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table of contents and appendices need to be finalized. | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The links in the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) don't work; however, all of the other links work, but will be fixed soon. • Still working with IT to ensure that the document is accessible and ADA compliant. The webpage is almost done and should be up by next week. • Still working on two sections: institution set standards and integration of planning. These two sections need to be edited and revised. Otherwise, everything else is good to go. • Please review, comment, and provide feedback to Rocio, especially if you note any information that needs to change. <p>Barbara thanked acknowledged Rocio for her hard work in completing the Midterm Report. Chisa also thanked Rocio for her approach to drafting the midterm report which made it easy to provide feedback.</p> <p>Richard provided an overview of accreditation and where we are in the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members were asked to read through the entire document and pay particular attention to the QFE and report back to constituency groups for feedback. • Committee Members were asked to read the section on Guided Pathways (GPS) drafted by Sara Mestas and Shiloh Blacksher. • Barbara asked for clarification on the timeline and getting the feedback to Rocio. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rocio stated that it would be helpful to receive the feedback as early as possible. <p>The Midterm Report will be sent to the Academic Senate Secretary for the 9/28 meeting. Feedback is needed as soon as possible so that the Senate doesn't finalize a document that is still being edited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor edits to the ALO introduction is anticipated and will be done as close to the deadline as possible. <p>Richard acknowledged that Rocio has been working diligently in other areas as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication to our community on programmatic accreditation was identified in the spring as needing a refresh. | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There about a dozen programs on the list and there still editing to be done. • That section of the accreditation website is much more detailed and provides more guidance for committee members with concerns or questions. | |
| 7. Institution Set-Standards. | 11:20 | <p>Barbara reported the following related to Institution Set Standards (ISS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normally IEC is the group that does this work. • Metrics used in midterm report was discussed (p.17) • There are 3 rows that we have to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Institution Set Standard Floor (lowest that we are willing to accept in outcomes for this metric) ○ Stretch Goal also known as aspirational goal. Haven't yet created, and it's now time to create them. ○ Course Completion Rate • Barbara suggested the numbers we might need going forward be kept at a 72 all the way through as the floor. • Due to COVID, it's possible the numbers could fluctuate. • Suggested the number be 2% higher for the stretch goals. • Richard provided background on why we are required to provide institution set standards. • Stretch goals will be reviewed in more detail at the next meeting. • ISS will be available at the next meeting. <p>Barbara provided an overview of the connection between Institution Set Standards and KPIs which is the core data that tells us how our students are doing. -</p> | |
| 8. Strategic Plan (Chisa, Richard) | 11:40 | <p>IEC was asked to bring its progress on a new Strategic Plan to Expanded PAC on November 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard met with Audrey and then looped Chisa in to the conversation about the Fall Summit. • Planning Summit will continue to focus on student equity questions. • Fall Summit scheduled for October 30. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Timeline b. Process - our work today | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Discussed three examples of new tools we have available to us:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guided Pathways 2. Title V Grant (emphasis on data with an equity focus) 3. EAB Navigation <p>The Strategic Plan needs to go to PAC in November and much of the content ought to be what we hear and learn from students and the workgroups who are working on parts of the work described in the summit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If our committees work together with a sense of what we are working toward will make them more effective. • The Strategic Plan is still a work in progress and the conversation will continue. The October 30 summit will provide an opportunity for more faculty to be a part of the conversation. • Audrey stated that it could be helpful at the summit to partner with RIE in terms of data that has been compiled. This will allow us to look which students are meeting goals and which student's aren't as well as the students that we have lost, etc., • The data is compelling and helps us understand how to connect those two things – real students and real scenarios. | |
| <p>9. College Mission Vision & Core Values (Barbara) <u>College's edits to its Mission, Vision, and Core Values.</u></p> | <p>11:50</p> | <p>Barbara stated that with respect to the mission for the accreditation standards – when we discuss our purpose and function, we are all experts for accreditation and a resource for the college.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A big component of the accreditation standards is the mission. The mission of our college should be the driving force behind what we are doing. • PAC revised the mission and which was Board approved on July 8. <p>Kristina provided some insight regarding the process at PAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the role of PAC to review the mission, vision, and core values. This is done on a yearly basis. • In 2017 it was clear that what college come up with didn't meet the accreditation standard, there | |

| | | | |
|--|--------------|---|--|
| | | <p>was a lot of pushback, and eventually it was revised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to remember that it's not the statement, but the mission of the college. • As we approach the 2024 visit, each year the mission, vision, and core values will be reviewed. It's important for us to have a voice to ensure that what the commission is expecting is what we have in that document. • Every other standard in the standards asks us to tie back to mission and if our mission is weak, that means that our response to those standards will be weak as well. • Chisa stated that it makes sense to bring back to PAC so when we're reviewing it – we can see what it has been in the past, but can also look at the standard at the same time. | |
| <p>10. 1SSS Conf-Oct2017 – Accreditation Online – BMS Presentation we discussed today at the Timeline meeting. Please add it to that ASC Workgroup meeting invitation for August 20, 2020. It is ADA compliant for the web (fyi). Please also add to the calendar narrative that slide #26 has the "Lessons Learned Take 2" information.</p> | <p>11:55</p> | <p>Our next big project will be in Spring 2024 which is when the ISER will be sent to ACCJC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that we bring back to the Committee for an agenda item in October. • Richard suggested that the Committee carefully review the Purpose, Function and Goals which will be discussed at the October meeting. • During last Accreditation review in 2012 and 2007, there was a debrief that focused on how we wanted to do things next time. The link to that presentation is in the agenda item. | |