Accreditation Steering Committee – May 30, 2017

Attendees: Mallory Newell, ~~Tono Ramirez~~, ~~Anu Khanna~~, ~~Susan Cheu~~, George Robles, Karen Hunter, ~~James Nguyen~~, Mayra Cruz, Anita Muthyala-Kandula, ~~Lorrie Ranck~~, Marisa Spatafore, Brian Murphy, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Christina Espinoza-Pieb

The committee reviewed feedback from the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) and the incorporated quality focus essay. The feedback up to today’s deadline has chiefly included minor typos and a reported broken link. There was feedback from FCOPBT in regards to the Action Project around Integrated Planning where there was a recommendation to require a PBT member to attend the other PBT members, as FCOPBT meets only once a month, this would be a large commitment. It was agreed that we could remove this action item and maintain the item where a representative from each PBT give an update monthly at College Council. Members of the committee had an opportunity to share any additional feedback that came in. Mayra Cruz reported that she has heard that the way the Standards for Classified Senate and Academic Senate were combined in the ISER was done very well. Karen Hunter agreed. Newell also mentioned that when she presented the report at EAC that some expressed concern they were not involved. While College Council did not assign a Standard to the EAC, Newell reminded the group that they did appoint a member representative to the Accreditation Steering Committee, Anita Kandula, who has actively participated in meetings during the year. She also reminded the group that they may provide feedback on the report through May 30. Newell further advised the Accreditation Steering Committee that Kandula had provided a summary of the process and timeline to EAC last spring.

The group then reviewed a two-page feedback submission, not tied to any particular Standard or text, that was signed by librarians and library staff regarding the ePrintit system. The letter stated, and it was confirmed by Karen Hunter and Mayra Cruz, that the issue was brought to both Classified Senate and Academic Senate and action is underway. Hunter shared that Classified Senate has been working with Vice Chancellor Joe Moreau who has already worked to reduce the minimum balance from $5 to $1. Hunter reported that the Library is already scheduled to make a follow-up presentation to share feedback from students and staff on the changes. The committee agreed that the topic was not appropriate to incorporate into the report but to make it clear that the college has channels for addressing concerns such as these, as is currently in progress. As the process has already started through the appropriate channels and progress is being made, Newell will respond to the group to thank them for the feedback, advise them that the Steering Committee agreed the ISER is not an appropriate vehicle in which to include their specific issue, and reiterate that the process is moving forward to address their concern.

Newell reported that she presented the ISER to the following groups this month: Academic Senate (May 8), Classified Senate (May 9), Technology Committee (May 4), SSPBT (May 4), DASB (May 24), IPBT (May 30), Campus Budget (May 23), FCOPBT (May 26) and for final approval by College Council on June 1. Then it will be agendized to the Board of Trustees for approval on June 12.

Mayra Cruz then provided an update on work being done around the Institutional Metrics. She noted that the English and ESL departments, the CTE Perkins committee, the Enrollment Advisory Team, and VIDA submitted their plans. The Math department and the EAC have not yet submitted a report and the deadline has passed. Cruz will continue to work with the two areas on getting their plans in before the end of the term. Cruz will provide an update to College Council at the next meeting.

The group then discussed the goals for 2016-17 in line with our 7-year planning cycle. The cycle shows the group will review and update the mission statement, continue to review the Institutional Metrics, continue work on using the Equity-Driven Change Model and rubric to review the Educational Master Plan, and begin work on the ISER Action Plans and Action Projects. These goals were agreed upon by the group.

The group then completed the Annual Shared Governance Reflection Survey. Finally the group discussed the need to revisit our level of “low income”. Currently, the Research Office defines low income as a family income below $24,000. The San Jose Mercury News just reported that HUD changed the low income status to $84,750 for a family of four: <http://www.mercurynews.com/2017/04/22/in-costly-bay-area-even-six-figure-salaries-are-considered-low-income/>. The group will revisit this indicator in the fall.