



Committee Name: Accreditation Steering Committee

Meeting Date: March 1, 2021

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

Start time: 3:00am

End time: 4:00pm

Minutes Prepared By: M.Wick

Attendees:

Stacy Thompson, Samantha Kessler, Heather Clements, Abigail Patton, Safiyyah Forbes, Yvette Nahinu, Christina Read, Jeanne Wilson, Robert Nakamoto, Cynthia Gordon da Cruz, Noell Adams, Morgan Butler, Rachael Tupper-Eoff, Christine Herrera, Audrey Trotter, Aaron Deetz, Lannibeth Calvillo, Ming Ho, Mimi Munoz, Nathaniel Rice, Maria Wick, Dale Wagoner, Shannon Stanley, Thomas Dowrie, Debbie Trigg, Lael Adediji, Heather Hernandez, Billy Delos Santos, Angela Castellanos, Megan Parker, Deonne Kunkel-Wu, Manny Kang, Patricia Shannon, John Chan, Yvonne Wu-Craig, Christina Davis, Jamal Cooks, Miguel Colon, Cheree Manicki

Agenda Item	Information/Discussion	Action
1. Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome from Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) 	
2. Approval of the 3/1/2021 Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes: March 1, 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes -22 • No - • Abstentions-2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christine Herrera motioned to approve the agenda. • Cynthia Gordon da Cruz second the motion. <p>Agenda was approved for March 1, 2021.</p>
3. Approval of the 2/19/2021 Minutes and Participation List	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes: March 1, 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes -23 • No - • Abstentions-4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manny Kang motioned to approve the minutes. • Deonne Kunkel-Wu second the motion. <p>Minutes were approved with edits for February 19, 2021.</p>
4. Follow-Up Action Items Identified at the 02/19/2021 Meeting (CAL Team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website Taskforce Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Website audit committee created in response to the feedback we were receiving from the group around the findings, when searching for evidence. The group found broken links, links that lead to nowhere, misspelled words on the website or information on the website that was severely outdated. ○ Website audit committee made up of handful of people from Student Services and CAL Team. 	<p>Use the Google document to track broken links or misspelled words.</p>

<p>5. Chabot College 2022 ISER Timeline Check-In: Where are we? (Samantha)</p>	<p>i. Upcoming Standard 2nd drafts due:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I.A and I.B – 3/1 2. I.C – 3/22 3. II.A – 3/31 4. II.B – 3/1 5. II.C – 3/8 6. III.A, III.B, III.C, III.D, - 3/30 7. IV.A – 3/8 8. IV.B – 3/30 <p>ii. Campus-wide review of drafts – beginning March</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. April and May we will be compiling this report and identifying gaps, making changes, and preparing for summer. Heavy editing will be in summer. 	
<p>6. Employee Survey Response Rates, Next Steps, and Aligning to Standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey responses are aggregated by race and ethnicity. Each question shows a students response to various questions. • This includes student feedback, student beliefs. This is a good handout to skim through and see if there's anything on your standards. • Newly added to this handout is Native Americans, Alaskan students and Pacific Islander and Hawaiian students. In italics because the margin of error for this group is really high, meaning that we're not totally confident that if 83% is responded in a particular way in our survey, meaning that 83% of all Native Americans would say the same thing. • Despite the large margin of error, it really moves us towards equity to at least show the data. • New handout: Campus Climate for Diversity and Equity. • For anyone working on a standard that includes equity, or about our mission, which is, committed to equity, this would be a great handout to look through. • Update: Response Rates of the Employee Survey. • Classified professionals: 149 full time and part time: 99 responded. That is a 66% response rate. • Faculty: 171 full time on campus at the moment, 129 responded. That is a 75% response rate. • Faculty Administrators: 25 administrators on campus, 25 administrators responded. That is a 100% response rate. 	<p>Regarding Employee Survey and Standards: Look up your standard and see how those on campus responded and see if there's anything that can be added to your evidence, based on the employee survey.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part time faculty had a lower response rate. There are 332 on campus and 59 responded. That is an 18% response rate. • We anticipate having this particular new handout done in about two meetings. • The new handout is the percentage of everyone put together. The faculty classified professionals and administrators, who agreed or strongly agreed with any particular item. It will be grouped by standard. • We also anticipate being able to just aggregate this to see if there's differences in the way classified professionals, faculty, and administrators responded to each of those questions. • It will be organized by standards to easily look up what you're looking for and provide more evidence. • These handouts help people understand the data. 	
<p>7. Dr. Thompson's ACCJC Training Takeaways</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACC JC website has training videos. • Standard: 16 sections, 16 sub sections. • The first draft is the overview and we all go through it together and make comments. • The second draft is more detailed where you have to write a paragraph about each of the sub sections and what you know to overview for the section. Then you write up a paragraph for each of the sub sections. • At the end of that you determine if they meet the standard. Either they meet it or they don't. There's no in between. • We met with the President and the assistant who's working on the visiting team and we went through each of the standards drafts and any questions written in your report. • We discussed them and would try to triangulate your question. I.e., I had a question about not having the appropriate evidence that shows the student learning outcomes, once they were assessed, how is that information used to improve or inform instruction? In the link to the site for the program review was 25 pages. The information needed was in three paragraphs of that evidence. Please if you have large document, make sure that it can easily be navigated. • Takeaway: one or two pieces of evidence needed when you're making a point. Link directly to that evidence section. • If it's not in evidence, if we can find it on the website then we've been looking at the website site outward facing. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outward facing to the Community has to be the same information on our website that links to our information. This information needs to be pristine and precise. • Do we provide the same services in any off campus classes that we're that we have, as we are on campus classes? • You do not need to meet the Standard as long as you have a plan in place to meet the Standard and that is clearly articulated. 	
8. Workshops	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Finalizing Evidence Acronyms Lists b. Draft Editing 	
9. Next Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting:	Monday, March 15, 2021 3:00pm	

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