



Committee Name: Accreditation Steering Committee

Meeting Date: February 19, 2021

Meeting Chaired By: Dr. Stacy Thompson (ALO), Samantha Kessler

Start time: 11:00am

End time: 12:00pm

Minutes Prepared By: M.Wick

Attendees:

Samantha Kessler, Heather Clements, Abigail Patton, Audrey Trotter, Christina Read, Cynthia Gordon da Cruz, Debbie Trigg, Deonne Kunkel-Wu, Heather Hernandez, John Chan, Kevin Kramer, Matt Kritscher, Megan Parker, Nathaniel Rice, Safiyyah Forbes, Shannon Stanley, Robert Nakamoto, Cheree Manicki, Christine Herrera, Lael Adediji, Thomas Dowrie, Gabriel Chaparro, Kristin Lima, Begona Cirera, Jeanne Wilson, Mumtaj Ismail, Arnold Paguio

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1. Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome from Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) 	
2. Approval of the 2/19/2021 Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes: February 19, 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes -21 • No - • Abstentions-2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safiyyah Forbes motioned to approve the agenda. • Christine Herrera second the motion. <p>Agenda was approved for February 19, 2021.</p>
3. Approval of the 2/01/2021 Minutes and Participation List	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes: February 19, 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes -21 • No - • Abstentions-2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christine Herrera motioned to approve the minutes. • Cynthia Gordon da Cruz second the motion. <p>Minutes were approved with edits for February 01, 2021.</p>
4. Follow-Up Action Items Identified at the 02/01/2021 Meeting (CAL Team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence List Excel Template sent to Steering Committee b. Employee Survey reviewed with Standard and Sub-Standard Leads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Employee survey sent to campus on Flex Day <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excited by how much of a response we got on FLEX day. Yesterday we're up to 271 responses with that being roughly 56% of classified professionals. ○ Between 70% and 75% of full time faculty responding and 96% of administrators. ○ We did incorporate almost all the feedback that we received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cynthia will put the handouts up as it might apply to your standard. The goal is to have all the handouts and summary up by the end of the semester.

<p>5. Chabot College 2022 ISER Timeline Check-In: Where are we? (Samantha)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Standard 1st drafts received from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I.A and II.B returned with comments 2. IV.A and II.C 3. I.C ii. Upcoming draft due dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2/26: III.A, III.B, III.C, III.D, I.B, II.A <p>b. Campus-wide review of drafts – beginning March</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Committees ii. Divisions, Departments, Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They want something that specifically proves they are the best two or three pieces of evidence that specifically proves the standard. Very different than how it was in the past. ○ Looking for applicability is really what they're looking for. ○ Standard III get first draft submitted before end of March. ○ Standard IV.C IV.D written by Ron at the district. ○ By the end of March and into the beginning of April, we do want to start sharing drafts out. They'll be in pieces still by standards, but especially those standards that are relevant to specific committees like technology, facilities, and standards relative to PRAC. ○ We want to allow the committees time to read the drafts and comment on them. It'll be less overwhelming when the whole report is shared committees will already be familiar with some of the parts. The ones that pertain to instructional programs Dr. Thompson want to send to the divisions at the end of March early April, so that faculty can start looking at the instructional areas also Student Services it would be good to share with the Student Services groups those drafts after the first rounds of edits towards the end of the semester. 	
<p>6. Dr. Thompson's ACCJC Training Takeaways</p>	<p>a. Tabled to 3/1</p>	
<p>7. Key Takeaways from ACCJC Training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the leads and writers were there. • We asked him questions and his presentation is loaded onto the Google drive and it's posted on our accreditation website. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You have to interpret the standard in precisely the same way that either he or the visiting team will do so that your shortened book checks off all the boxes. • I was relieved when learned that essentially if you check in with him he's going to give that same feedback to the visiting team i.e. this is who this standard applies to, this is the kind of evidence we would need. The reassurance that we can be brief was helpful. • Having seen all of the standards on the same slides and then him going over each of them and explaining what we're supposed to be looking for and what each meant, and so it was easy to see overlap in different areas that I would have not seen because I'm looking at it in just this long document, rather than splitting on a page, so I appreciated that he showed us the different standards and then how we could go by answering ours supporting our evidence with the things that we're doing. • He guided us through talking about a policy, so if it is talking about a policy or procedure that's kind of leading you to looking for those policy or procedure documents. Is it looking for a process and, if so, any kind of documentation that supports or is evidence of the process is helpful if it's looking for outcomes then leaning on the data and different reports for evidence. • His talking about brevity and writing I wanted to reinforce that because it is so different from how self- evaluations have been written in the past. • One thing that will be mentioned to the Cal team next week is that the commission met in January and their next meeting is in June, but the actions they took on colleges in January to reaffirm their accreditation for seven years, there were four colleges that received full seven-year reaffirmation. But what was clear about looking at all four of those reports was the brevity, they really all stuck to the suggested page limits. It's ok if you have to go over but we're finding more and more, the reports are very brief and very concise. Reports could have been 400 pages, many of them were closer to between 250 and at a max 300 pages. 	
--	---	--

8. Next Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting:	a. Monday, March 1, 2021 3:00pm (regular schedule)	
---	--	--

Mission Statement

Chabot College is a dynamic, student-centered community college that serves the educational, career, job skill, and personal development needs of our community. We provide culturally responsive, revitalizing, and sustaining learning and support services driven by a goal of equity. Building upon students' strengths and voices, we empower students to achieve their goals and lead us towards an equitable and sustainable world.

*Pending BOT Approval with EMP