Join Zoom Meeting

https://fullcoll-edu.zoom.us/j/87474945476?pwd=RVFDME4zVFRXZlc5b1pFV1hKNTQ0QT09

Meeting ID: 874 7494 5476

Passcode: 592797

Attendees:

Danielle Fouquette

José Ramón Núñez

Carlos Ayon

Roger Perez

Daniel Javier Berumen

Albert Abutin

Ken Starkman

Bridget Kominek

Kim Vandervort

Josh Ashenmiller

Melissa McLellan

David Grossman

Douglas Eisner

Rod García

Carolina Santillán

Housekeeping:

- 1. Call to order
 - a. Meeting called to order at 10:01 AM
- 2. Agenda
 - a. Agenda approved by everyone
- 3. Review of notes from previous meeting(s)
 - a. Aug. 26, 2022
 - b. Minutes approved; Bridget Kominek moved to approve minutes; Kim Vandervort 2nd; all approved
- 4. Public Comments
 - a. None
- 5. Announcements
 - a. None

Old Business:

1. Meeting with District and Cypress accreditation leaders (update)

- Met with Cherry Li-Bugg, Gabrielle Stanco (NOCCCD Director of research), Jill Bauer, Bryan Ventura, José Ramón, Roger Perez, and Danielle Fouquette
 - a) They updated the district timeline
 - b) Discussed the Functional Map
 - c) They also discussed what the process should be when we have a recommendation or area of improvement for the district
 - It was suggested to discuss any recommendations with district leadership first and if any action is needed, they will then proceed to share with the District Consultation Council (DCC)
 - ii. It was suggested by our ASC members to get our recommendations documented and included in council agendas, so they can be included in the minutes, and can be used as data for future ISERs
 - a. Adding our recommendations to DCC agenda is not assured; the best thing to do is discuss it and include recommendations in the ISER; Roger will ask Alba Recinos about the process; all of this can be a recommendation in the ISER for DCC to include an ASC representative

2. Functional Map (Update)

- Danielle has begun to receive the requested information for the function map (templates); she's also reached out to the departments that haven't submitted anything
- Danielle shared the functional map that District sent. It was developed independently from what Cypress and Fullerton put together
 - a) The functional map is meant to focus on how the district supports the college, but their map is more from the top down and focuses more on their own functions; now it's up to CC and FC to work with what District provided
- NOCE does not need to create a functional map; they're their own entity; FC provides certain services, but is not one of our functions, thus it shouldn't be included
- 3. Service Area Outcome project and program review (Update)
 - We got a recommendation from ACCJC to disaggregate student services outcomes data; the problem is that the data wasn't being collected at the student level; we added a plan in the midterm report for each area to identify at least one SAO where data can be collected at the student level and be included in program review
 - Doug and Bridget attended a meeting with Student Services managers; there's a lot of new managers that were not familiar with the accreditation process

- Some student service areas were concerned about giving out identifying information of students; it was explained that there are ways to get the data without including personal information
- o There are issues with Tableau preventing dashboards from being built
- o Each student services area should provide an inventory of their outcomes
- Bridget suggested for accreditation leaders to schedule one on one meetings with the student services deans to discuss the process and ask them to collect their area outcomes and what data to collect
 - a) Danielle will work with Doug, Dani, and Albert to create a template for deans to fill out
- Doug and Mary will be sharing a program review template with PRC, which includes disaggregation and equity analysis (Program Review Committee is a Faculty Senate committee with members who are mostly faculty and not a lot of people from student services)
- We need to keep in mind that there are new departments and new people that are not familiar with the processes and procedures of the college
- o We also need to make it clear that part of the PRC process is planning
 - a) Programs need to identify their goals, how they are going to accomplish them, and how they are going to get there
 - b) Programs need to plan outcomes that they need to keep revisiting during the review process, which is equally critical
 - c) All of this should be done in a meaningful way that helps individual departments
 - d) We also need to address how planning ties to student services areas, which is not clear (it's clear for instructional programs, but not student services)
- Our main concern and focus for now should be the recommendation from ACCJC, which is for student services departments to have at least one outcome that they can obtain data from to disaggregate and see if the programs are serving students in an equitable way and/or how they can improve their services
- 4. Evidence Extravaganza tentative dates
 - o Wednesday Oct. 19 8:30-10:00 a.m.
 - o Thursday Oct. 20 2:00-3:30 p.m.
 - Danielle will have more updates in the next meeting; she will request a computer lab through the master calendar
 - We would invite people to come to participate in searching for evidence

New Business:

- 1. Draft ACCJC Standards (review and possible action)
 - a. Danielle shared the draft
 - b. We need to be aware of the changes

- c. District is hosting a townhall meeting from ACCJC to review proposed changes to the standards, Tuesday, September 20, 1-2pm, in person; Josh and Roger are available to attend
- d. Reactions to proposed changes:
 - i. Language is much clearer, simplified, and direct
 - ii. Strong expectation for program review to be utilized as a central part for meeting accreditation standards and as evidence
 - iii. Library and Student Services are not mentioned- State Library Association is not too happy about it
 - iv. There is more emphasis on student success and how the programs accomplish that, instead of an emphasis on the programs themselves
 - v. There aren't any expectations about Student Learning Outcomes
- e. Review these changes and reach out to Josh and Roger if you have questions or need clarification, which they can bring up during the townhall meeting
- 2. Advanced ISER training (information)
 - a. Jayme has sent out the invitations; please respond so JR can have a good head count
 - b. We need to continue being proactive in working with students—AS and other committees are having a hard time getting students involved; they are working to recruit them; will probably invite student ambassadors to the training
- 3. Standard Chairs reports (information and possible action)
 - a. None

Standard Co-chair Workgroup Planning session (TBD)

Meeting adjourned at 11:51 AM

Dates to remember:

Sept. 22: Advanced ISER training

Dec. 15, 2023: Final draft of ISER due to ACCJC

Oct. 2024: Site visit

Fullerton College's Accreditation Philosophy and Goals

The reaffirmation of accreditation process provides an opportunity for Fullerton College to evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, practices, and policies. The college is committed to a self-evaluation that draws on campus-wide engagement at all stages. It will employ a process that facilitates accurate and thorough identification and documentation of best practices at Fullerton College that meet or exceed accreditation standards, as well as noting opportunities to improve. The resulting ACCJC Institutional Self-Evaluation Report will accurately document the nature and substance of Fullerton College and will reflect a broad consensus of faculty and staff.