**Attendees:**

Danielle Fouquette

José Ramón Núñez

Kim Vandervort

Dani Wilson

Kelley Jones-Horwood

Daniel Javier Berumen

Roger Perez

Josh Ashenmiller

David Grossman

Ken Starkman

Albert Abutin

Douglas Eisner

Bridget Kominek

Carolina Santillán

Housekeeping:

1. Call to order
   1. Meeting called to order 10:02 AM
2. Agenda
   1. Agenda approved
3. Review of notes from previous meeting(s)
   1. May 6, 2022
   2. Minutes approved- Bridget Kominek moved to approve as amended; Dani Wilson 2nd ; all approved
4. Public Comments
   1. None
5. Announcements
   1. None

**Old Business**

1. Program Review, Planning, and Resource Allocation/Budgeting draft recommendation (Update)
   1. IIC request for scope and timeline for developing a plan
      1. They will be coordinating with PBSC and Program Review Committee
   2. Response from Program Review and Planning Committee and PBSC
      1. They’re a little concerned that it could be too broad or too narrow
      2. We also need to come up with a timeline
      3. Can it be done in 6 months or multi-year
      4. It was discussed at PBSC meeting, Daniel and/or Josh will debrief us
         1. Everyone in Planning Review and PBSC was in favor of it
         2. PBSC would like to be aligned more with PRC
      5. This project and timeline for strategic planning will be more of a long-term situation, can’t be fixed in three months
         1. All the feedback, discussion, and symposiums done in the Fall; they will provide information in Spring since it requires Board approval
         2. Daniel is hoping everything will be complete by March
2. Functional Map (Update)
   1. Update from meeting with Cypress
   2. Danielle met with Jill and Bryan Ventura
   3. Came up with a tentative structure
   4. Danielle shared the Google doc
      1. She identified areas that sort of follow the Accreditation Standards
         1. Student Services
         2. Academics
         3. Human Resources
         4. Physical Resources/Facilities
         5. Fiscal & Financial Resources
         6. Governance and Public Affairs (?)/ Planning (?)
   5. Went through District, Fullerton, and Cypress functions
   6. They will be meeting twice in the summer
      1. First meeting will be Thursday, June 2nd @ 11:30 AM
3. Service Area Outcome project (Update)
   1. One of the recommendations they received was to disaggregate student services
   2. They took the recommendation to the Student Services leadership team
      1. Managers, classified, faculty, and students—they read the recommendation and gave their thumbs up
      2. Their recommendation was for each area/program to identify at least one outcome that can be drilled down and disaggregated to students
      3. They also identified specific questions that will be acknowledged by each area/program
      4. The programs will work with Daniel or someone else from the research office
      5. Timeline: Summer/early Fall, then annually; will tie into program review process
         1. They can figure out which data is helpful, and which is not
         2. Programs are already working on these reports, they hope to have at least one outcome identified in early Fall
         3. Danielle suggested we have an inventory/list of outcomes by service areas, website, document, or TEAMS page from June 2022 and on; Daniel can help with this and the group can discuss further on how we can expand this process
         4. We also need to find a place where all this information should be available
         5. One of the recommendations to Program Review, Planning, and Staff Development was to have focus training for program review completion, particularly the equity plan
         6. We did make a commitment to include this data in the report
         7. Danielle will follow up with Mary
4. Evidence Collection
   1. Planning for Evidence Extravaganza (Fall 2022)
      1. Danielle is more than happy to organize it
         1. Virtual and/or on campus
         2. They did one in the past, 2 days at the computer lab
         3. She showed people what to look for and people did find evidence
         4. What’s important is deciding what evidence to use for each standard
         5. It’s best to just collect evidence, not necessarily by standard, it just needs to pinpoint to them
         6. People will have the option of doing it in person or Zoom
   2. Roger’s workgroup is having some challenges in finding evidence since 2017
      1. It’s very time-consuming work
      2. A lot of missing documents—they haven’t been uploaded to website in a while and it’s very unorganized
      3. Jennifer and Carlos suggested that each department work on the process of searching for and/or updating evidence
      4. There are a lot of ACCJC guides that can help with a list of suggested evidence that can be shared with everyone looking for evidence
      5. Kim also acknowledged that it’s hard for her committee to find evidence when program/committee websites haven’t been updated with recent minutes and agendas
      6. There is a person working with Campus Communications that works on updating the agendas and minutes; we just need to tell committees and programs to submit them
      7. There’s more of an emphasis in evidence rather than narrative
5. [Workgroup meeting schedules for fall](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1O6LAkel2nhZjbPTMbdmv_LXCdDw_vX1ZxNd76xDCV8M/edit?usp=sharing)
   1. Published schedule of workgroup meetings
      1. Just fill in the Google doc once your Fall schedule is set, this way, everyone has access to the information for the workgroups
      2. It’s up to the groups to establish whether they want to meet on campus or Zoom
      3. Doug’s group will have meetings over the summer

**New Business**

1. Review of ACCJC actions
   1. Danielle has been reviewing the actions and started to compile the recommendations; changed language from compliance to requirement
      1. She organized it for SLOA as an example (she shared it with the group)
         1. She placed it on everyone’s TEAMs folder
      2. She also reviewed the visiting team’s report
      3. Seeing a pattern can be helpful for us to see what areas to focus on
      4. She’ll also review the June actions once they come out and will share with everyone
      5. It’s a good idea to focus on the patterns that come up during the review
   2. Distance education- we do an audit of our online courses to help review DE anonymously
      1. But people need to do a self-assessment plus training, which is what the accreditation team requested
      2. The accreditation team picks courses from a list to observe
      3. They’ll be looking for student to student interaction, not just faculty-student
2. Standards reports: Presentation of draft ISER sections
   1. Standard IIA- 4 (Kim)
      1. They shared a copy of the template with what they have so far
      2. English and Math will no longer offer pre-collegiate courses
         1. Class schedule and minutes of meetings where this was decided can be used as evidence
         2. The curriculum still exists for articulation purposes, but the courses are not offered; need to look at six-year review
      3. They will focus more on ESL
   2. Standard IIB- 3/C (Doug)
      1. Choosing the evidence is important
      2. Looking at Library and learning support services- they have a lot of evidence, but they need to decide on which services to focus on
      3. They will work on it during the summer to have a better report in the Fall
      4. Will add COVID/pandemic language to the services provided
3. Other items from Standards co-chairs
4. Standard I
5. Standard II A
   1. Examinations
      1. Department wide exams
      2. BUS 100F exam—it’s not a good example because it’s not updated frequently
      3. Reach out to Assessment Center, but they said they’re not a department, so it doesn’t apply to them
      4. On ISER examples that Danielle shared, they focused on placement exams instead
      5. We can ask Deans for help, and make sure we’re looking for placement exams or credit by examination
6. Standard IIB and C
7. Standard III
8. Standard IV
   1. Timeline for updating Strategic Plan

Standard Co-chair Workgroup Planning session (11:30-12:00)

***Next Meetings: August 26 and September 16, and then 1st & 3rd Fridays on Zoom***

**Meeting adjourned: 12:01 PM**

**Dates to remember:**

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.