# MERRITT COLLEGE
## AFR Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
### October 21, 2015
### 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

**Present:** Dr. Audrey Trotter, Mia Kelly, Jennifer Lough Kennedy, Samantha Knappenberger, Kinga Sidzinska, Nghiem Thai, Lorna Pascual, Romeo Garcia, Dr. Arnulfo Cedillo, Dan Lawson, Ron Perez, Chris Grampp, Dr. Jennifer Shanoski, Dr. Mario Rivas, Sheila Metcalf-Tobin, Maril Bull, Frances Moy, Stephanie Harding, Rachel Antrobus, Dinh Truong, Dr. Rosemary Delia, Clifton Coleman, Tim Brice, Dr. Detti Del Rosario, Dr. Siri Brown, Dr. Arja McCray, Dr. Lilia Chavez, Dr. Tae-Soon Park, Ann Elliott, Debra Jacks

**Absent:**

**Guests:**

| AGENDA ITEM | SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION | ACTION/FOLLOW-UP |
|---|---|---|
| **I. Welcome** | Welcome and quick introduction of the AFR Core Team | |
| **II. Call To Action** | I. Dr. Wise Allen, Interim Vice President of Instruction, spoke to the group about the importance of the accreditation process.<br>    a. Dr. Allen reviewed and reinforced the definition of the ACCJC Sanctions Criteria.<br>    b. A question was asked: Do we have to get to warning before we get to reaffirmation?<br>        i. The College can move toward full affirmation without being on warning.<br>        ii. We need to be able to prove sustainability.<br>    b. A comment was made: If we do the work, we can affirm ourselves that we will get off. | |
| **II. Sharing and Learning from One Another** | I. College Recommendation (CR) Sub-Committees reported on their Team's Progress?<br>    a. CR1: Co-Lead reported that the team has been meeting. CR 1 spent time doing their gap analysis and identifying how they will respond to their recommendation.<br>        i. They need to decipher between evidence vs. speculations.<br>        ii. The team assigned each team member to research different sections.<br>    b. CR2: Co-Lead reported that the team has met several times so far. The team did a gap analysis to see how they will respond to their recommendation.<br>        i. The team has not identified real evidence that the College's planning process matches up with the College's Mission. The team will ask for minutes from | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | the College's Shared Governance Committees to review how the mission is incorporated into the adaption of bylaws, revisions of processes and be part of program review.<br>    ii.  Corrective action completed: The team requested that mission be posted on the homepage and now it is.<br>c.  CR3: Co-Lead reported that the team met on October 14.<br>    i.  Reviewed the external report and Self-Study.<br>    ii.  The Sub-Committee divided up the sections between team members<br>    iii.  The sub-Committee has developed an internal Dropbox<br>    iv.  They haven't found documentation and evidence supporting their college recommendation<br>    v.  Discussed that the sub-committee has a lot to respond to for this College Recommendation.<br>    vi.  She updated that the Sub-Committee can use more people<br>    vii.  The District has a model on the integrated planning and budgeting model.<br>d.  CR4: The Co-Lead reported that the team has been meeting. They have a lot of out-of-compliance standards to address as part of their College Recommendation<br>    i.  The team has divided the standards among the team to do their gap analysis and will report back on their sections.<br>    ii.  In practice, the team found that they will need to identify corrective actions and measures to ensure the college meets the program review Standards.<br>    iii.  The gap analysis revealed that many links to evidence were missing.  Overall, evidence to demonstrate compliance to the Standards will be key in drafting the College Recommendation written response.<br>    iv.  The group discussed that comprehensive program review along with annual updates is needed for allocation of funds.<br>e.  CR5: Currently there is only a Faculty Co-Lead for this recommendation. The Co-Lead reported they have been meeting and have encountered similar issues in documenting broad based dialogue about Standards for Student | CR3: Check with the District to see their model on Integrated Planning and budgeting and share the binder with other committees. |

| | | Achievement and the institutional processes for accessing progress in meeting those Standards.<br>f. CR6: Currently there is only a Classfied Co-Lead for this recommendation. There is a possibility that this Sub-committee may be able to complete a response to the non-compliance Standards through the work of the SLOAC committee. Areas of concerns include:<br>   i. Overlapping Standards across College Recommendations which creates perceived duplication of efforts.<br>   ii. Members of SLOAC have stated that they may not be able to answer the questions until the work of other CR recommendation team is complete.<br>   iii. Interim VPI responded that SLOs serves as the foundation for integrated planning, budget and resource allocation.<br>   iv. If SLOs are not completed College wide there will be may be long standing implication to the AFR.<br>g. CR7: Co-lead reported the challenge of obtaining a current Classified Staff evaluation list.<br>   i. Currently, no individual at the campus maintains this or monitors this type of list. The Sub-Committee's recommendation is to assign a specific campus based person to this task.<br>   ii. A question was posed by a group member regarding consequences of non-adherence to the policy of evaluation.<br>      1. VPI Allen identified that there is hierarchy of communication regarding the tracking of all Faculty, Staff and Administer evaluation completion.<br>         a. VPI Allen also reiterated that non-compliance with District policies may warrant termination in the Peralta District.<br>h. CR8: Co-Lead reported they have met twice on Wednesdays and have identified evidence. They will be drafting a response next week.<br>   i. A question arose in reference to the quality of the | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | response. What does adequate mean?<br>    i.   CR9: Co-Lead stated that they have met twice. The team is reviewing a draft of the College's Collegial Handbook. There are drafts of governance structures. Some Bylaws are not consistence in how they make decisions. | |
| **II. Strategies for College Recommendation Sub-Committee Goal Achievement** | I.   The AFR Core Team requested that the Sub-Committees conduct a Gap Analysis using the following college documents:<br>    a.  Merritt College Self-Evaluation Report<br>    b.  External Evaluation Report, May 8, 2015<br>    c.  ACCJC Standards cited in the ACCJC Action Letter dated June 29, 2015<br>II.  The AFR Core Team reviewed responses to the following questions and a Student Success PowerPoint brought to the group by the Research and Planning Officer:<br>    d.  What if the Gap Analysis reveals the need to start over?<br>    e.  Where can I find the information needed to show how the College meets the Standards?<br>    f.  Utilize College Recommendation Administrative Support Liaison to identify sources of information and to clarify institutional process and policies<br>    g.  Access Shared Governance Committee By-Laws and Archives<br>    h.  What do I do if information on institutional processes and policies is incomplete or unavailable | |
| **III. Dissemination of the AFR Templates** | I.   Reviewed the College Recommendation Response Writing Outline (10.19.2015):<br>II.  Reviewed the Evidence for Response to College Recommendation (10.19.2015) | |
| **III. AFR Webiste and Electronic Evidence Collection Coordinator Updates** | Tabled for the next Steering Committee Meeting | |
| **I. Processes for Co-Lead Stipends and OT Payments** | Informed the Co-Leads that the AFR Chair will compose a memo for Classified Co-Leads to give to their supervisors in order to process their overtime and will prepare the EPAP for Faculty. | |
| **II. Next Steering Committee Meeting** | Next Meeting November 4, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. | |