Join Zoom Meeting

<https://fullcoll-edu.zoom.us/j/83180290811?pwd=UVVoN0srZUNqRlRvRGVQUWxGK0Vxdz09>

Meeting ID: 831 8029 0811

Passcode: 859305

**Attendees:**

Danielle Fouquette

José Ramón Núñez

Douglas Eisner

Josh Ashenmiller

Bridget Kominek

Albert Abutin

Ken Starkman

Melisa McLellan

Kim Vandervort

Daniel Javier Berumen

Lisa McPheron

Roger Perez

Carolina Santillan

**Housekeeping:**

1. Call to order
	1. Meeting called to order ­­­10:01 AM
2. Agenda
	1. No changes to agenda
3. Review of notes from previous meeting
	1. 3 Feb 2023
		1. The approval of the minutes was postponed until the next meeting to give the committee time to review them.
4. Public Comments
	1. None
5. Announcements
	1. Update on Proposed Mission Statement
		1. The Board declined to vote on the Mission Statement but approved the Core Values.
			1. Fullerton College followed our process and both items were approved on our campus.
		2. The governance issue is the bigger problem since the Board did not provide reasons as to why they did not vote to approve.
		3. The status of the Mission Statement affects our work as it relates to Standard I.A.1. The other standards explain how our institution operates although everything is up in the air right now and we’ll have to explain that in the ISER.
		4. The IIC and Dr. Olivo will be deciding the process for revising the Mission Statement and taking it to the Board again.

**Old Business:**

1. Status of ASC recommendations for improvement
	1. PBSC-PRPC alignment (Daniel Berumen and Bridget Kominek)
		1. The co-chairs of IIC, PRPC, PBSC, and ASC met last week, and they discussed whether both committees should become dual reporting since the PRPC makes recommendations of the programs to be funded and the PBSC recommends the funding allocations.
		2. PRPC did not support their committee becoming dual reporting. However, it’s possible that making PBSC dual reporting can help address the problem the planning process is facing. PRPC decided not to recommend for both committees to become dual reporting. To them, making both committees dual reporting will not solve the problem. It’s best to look at the bigger picture and rather look at a multi-year process of reassessing and reevaluating our planning and resource allocation on campus. They came up with the idea for the IIC to take a lead in developing a multi-year plan to evaluate the process.
		3. Most members of PBSC also did not support both committees becoming dual reporting. Daniel sees the benefits of it since it would provide both committees some support and structure during the months when committees do not meet. However, only the faculty reps in PBSC were interested in it, but no one else was. The other members are concerned that it may slow down the process and classified are concerned about what this would mean for them. What the PBSC also discovered is that there is a gap in the process concerning PRPC and PBSC. The PRPC have a rubric that they use to decide which programs to fund. They then send items to PBSC, which functions as a pass through where they figure out how to fund everything, yet they’re the ones who receive all the pushback and criticism. PBSC doesn’t make any judgement calls on anything. Thus, that gap in the process needs to be addressed. The PBSC can work on providing more clarity and documentation as to how they make their decisions.
		4. Improving communication between both committees and the campus is key to fixing the situation. A better long-term plan is for us to reassess and reevaluate our program review and budgeting process. The IIC is better positioned to lead this work.
		5. Doug mentioned that the problem needs to be articulated better so everyone can understand what the problem is.
		6. José Ramón mentioned that the bigger issue is that our planning process in the college is incomplete. Planning review is the first big step in the process, but there are smaller steps that are not clear, as well as the various funding sources that the college has.
		7. Danielle mentioned that she is concerned that we are not meeting Standard I.B.9 – we have pieces, but they’re not really integrated. The planning process is the one we must address.
		8. As a campus, we must commit to have an integrated process, but it is going to take more than 18 months. The IIC will work on developing a working timeline.
		9. Conclusion: We can improve Standard I.B.9 by having the IIC take on the work of focusing on the missing pieces of the planning process and clarifying how programs get prioritized, approved, and funded. The result will be for us to have a more clear and comprehensive planning and resource allocation process that accounts for all the various funds that are available for funding, which includes program review funds.
	2. Committees page
		1. The agendas and minutes that have been sent to Campus Communications have been uploaded to the Committees page.
		2. If the content is coming in in a regular basis, then it can get posted on a regular basis, but that is not the case right now.
		3. Every committee should have a landing page like IIC. Some committees don’t even have a website or have old information posted.
		4. We need to make a recommendation to PAC (possibly Faculty Senate as well) to standardize this process and make it consistent. We must require all committees to have a responsible person that will oversee submitting the committee information and documents to Campus Communications.
		5. The first Collaborations Committee will meet on Tuesday, and they will discuss this item.
		6. It was suggested for IIC to also review this process.
	3. Student Services program review
		1. They will have more to say in the next ASC meeting since they have a workgroup meeting about it next week on Tuesday.
		2. The concern is that there is no uniformed approach on how these programs disaggregate the outcomes. They all have varied degrees and ways of disaggregating data and some programs did not have outcomes in place. Doug believes that we meet the standards for II.C.1-2 and will work on figuring out how to answer II.C.3.
		3. Daniel will assign someone in Institutional Research to create a list or a catalog of all student services outcomes. A special importance will be placed on the ones that can be disaggregated.
	4. Additional recommendations
		1. None.
2. Weave update and review of timeline
	1. Will postpone this discussion until after the review of the district function map. This discussion is also more relevant to the writing team, so they will meet after the meeting to discuss.
3. DFM Review
	1. District wanted CC and FC’s functions to be aligned in almost in every area. They also wanted to see who is responsible for what, but each college describes their functions differently.
		1. Administrative offices were not describing different operational units – they were explaining job descriptions and that’s not what ACCJC is looking for.
	2. The function map is pretty much final. The only concern is who to send it for review and feedback since our VPAS and VPSS positions are tentative.
	3. The functional map can also be used for evidence.

**New Business:**

1. Roadshow planning
	1. The goal was to have a draft ready for a roadshow by late spring.
		1. In the past, ASC shared a copy of the draft with shared governance groups for feedback and provided summaries in the roadshow, and everyone decided to do the same this time around.
		2. ASC committee members will participate in the roadshow. Kim volunteered to go to Classified Senate and Roger and Bridget will try to join her. Danielle and Josh will present to Faculty Senate. Josh can also attend other groups, except for Classified Senate. He will attend AS. José Ramón will present to PAC. Danielle will help prepare the power point slides and will probably customize it for the different groups.
		3. Bridget suggested for us to offer a Qualtrics survey for people to provide feedback. Josh suggested for the presenters to offer the historical context of why this work is important.
		4. The presentation to the Board will take place in the Fall. The first draft of the ISER will be shared with Dr. Olivo either before or after it’s shared with the governance groups, but she will decide that. José Ramón will speak to her.

**Meeting adjourned 11:48 AM**

**Dates to remember:**

Nov. 28, 2022: First draft of standard sections due to Danielle

Feb. 13, 2023: Second draft of standard sections due to Danielle

March 13, 2023: Completed draft of standard sections due to Danielle

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.