

Accreditation & SLO Committee Meeting
May 4, 2021 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Via Zoom, <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/902791748>

Co-Chairs: Dina Humble, Dr. Celia Huston

Attendees: Dina Humble, Laura Gowen, Celia Huston, Joanna Oxendine, Bethany Tasaka, Rick Hrdlicka, Kay Dee Yarbrough, Amy Avelar, Patty Quach Scott Thayer, Yvette Lee, Elaine Akers

Agenda Items	
Approval of Minutes	April 20 th – Rick motioned, Scott 2 nd .
Accreditation Evidence Database	Celia shared the beginning of the database she is creating for the accreditation process. This was just a rough draft as it will be very intensive and fluid.
Year-End Report	The beginning of the year end report was shared by Celia and she briefly went over some of the highlights and asked for details she may be missing.
ACCJC Draft Policy on Social Justice	Bethany and Yvette have reviewed the policy and shared out on what they have reviewed. They thought it would be worthwhile to review our mission again. This happens to be on the schedule for 22/23 but it can be moved up to a sooner time. Bethany continued to share what they had covered. There is a more detailed attachment below with all of their notes. See note in email. Disconnected from Internet.
2021/2022 Meeting Dates and Modality	Committee decided to continue to meet virtually in Fall 2021
Accreditation Newsletter, April 2021	Accreditation Newsletter was reviewed, approved, and sent to the campus
Guided Pathways & QFE	Dina shared that the two GP coordinators have resigned and that they are in the process of refining this role moving forward. Disconnected again...
Other	Celia shared with the group, that she has been reelected to serve as the Accreditation Chair for the following 2 years.

Next Meeting:

Accreditation & SLO Committee Meeting

May 4, 2021 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Via Zoom, <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/902791748>

NOTES FROM THE DISCUSSION ACCJC DRAFT POLICY ON SOCIAL JUSTICE:

- [Point 1] It might be worth reviewing the mission again since we just completed an accreditation visit. We can review the mission again with an equity lens and ask, “Who is missing?”
- [Point 2] Student level reporting pilot – working together with Research and Institutional Effectiveness. This will help provide disaggregated data.
- [Point 3] How do we usually assess this? It seems like we don’t know these details of how each faculty develops their classes. Is it more on a campus-wide scale (i.e. online vs face-to-face, and is that good enough?)
 - How do we know this serves the communities around us and their needs?
 - How do we know if faculty have equity in mind as they create their delivery modes, etc.? How can we see?
 - Look at their textbooks – this works for some departments on campus. This is only one component though.
 - Faculty will likely feel like this interferes with academic integrity.
 - Workshops/Training on how to take the idea of equity and apply it to different areas – English, Math, Sciences, etc. Focus on practical solutions to implement equity and social justice. Give ideas that are specific to departments/areas and make them interactive or personalized. Three components: Presentation, smaller groups (about 4 people) to discuss realistic applications, and Q&A for your own courses (could come at the end of the smaller group).
 - Doesn’t learning support services relate to our QFE? Can we look at those with a social justice lens?
 - Is there a way to gather this information? Possibly a survey of what faculty do in their classes?
- [Point 4] Curriculum looks at SLOs and does ask for diversity to be included. It’s hard to mandate this though. Curriculum does ask for a diversity or equity component; this usually comes as an OER textbook. This can be added to the SLO rubric? “If it’s not a specific SLO, explain why?” Training will also help – how can you engage diverse perspectives even if it’s not a full SLO?
- [Point 5] What are areas across campus doing to meet student needs online? How will that continue/change when we go back? We also provided Chromebooks and hot spots. The Help Desk was much more accessible. Maybe this needs to be talked about more? Websites could list what services they offer for various groups such as online, in person, etc.
- [Point 6] Guided Pathways and Academic Senate definitely started this process. Maybe assess its effectiveness after a period of time?
- [Point 7] Who has a say in the financial planning? Who holds them accountable? Is there oversight over the budget committee? Who actually makes decisions and how do we know if those decisions are grounded in social justice?
 - How do we know they’re tying it to the mission? If we review the mission and it changes, we will need to review the financial planning process as well.
 - Much of this might tie to the District, so it’s unclear what actions we can take. How do we ensure more meaningful consultation?
- [Point 8] This wording is vague – who is involved? Standard IV.A. seems to list everyone (managers, faculty, staff). How do we assess if this is being followed to ensure diversity and equity? Who defines “relevant perspectives”? It might be a good idea to ask which perspectives are missing?
- [Point 9] Evaluations of managers can help ensure leadership is ethical and effective. It would be great if you could make comments without putting your name. That would bring more honest results.