



## Accreditation and Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: 02/10/2025	Time: 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.	Location: AD/SS 207
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leticia Hector (ALO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Celia Huston (Faculty Lead)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Berry
<input type="checkbox"/> Alexander Cruz	<input type="checkbox"/> Rema Ghazaleh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fernando Gomez
<input type="checkbox"/> Yvonne Gutierrez-Sandoval	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reginald Metu	<input type="checkbox"/> Caleab Losee
<input type="checkbox"/> Amy Mills	<input type="checkbox"/> Joan Murillo	<input type="checkbox"/> Maryum Malika
<input type="checkbox"/> Dyami Ruiz-Martinez	<input type="checkbox"/> Bethany Tasaka	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vinnie Wu
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kay Dee Yarbrough		
ACCJC Standards Website		

Agenda Items	
<b>Approval of Minutes:</b>	The Committee reviewed the minutes to the January 27, 2025, meeting. <b>Hold – pending quorum.</b>
<b>Overview of Accreditation</b>	<p>Celia Huston gave an overview of accreditation. Accreditation is a process that ensures institutions of higher education meet established standards of quality and provides degrees, certificates, and/or credits that students and the community can trust. Internal self-evaluation by the institution at periodic intervals. External assessment of the institution by a peer review team.</p> <p><b>Common Accreditation Actions of Institutions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reaffirm Accreditation</li> <li>• Reaffirm Accreditation and Require a Follow-Up Report</li> <li>• Reaffirm Accreditation for 18 month and Require a Follow-Up Report</li> </ul>
<b>ACCJC Policy on Social Justice</b>	<p>With all the changes at the Federal level in regard to social justice, Celia gave the committee the different standards that list social justice for us to follow through the ACCJC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard 1: The institution establishes meaningful and ambitious goals for institutional improvement, innovation, and equitable student outcomes.</li> <li>• Standard 2: Academic and learning support programs promote equitable student success, and the institution evaluates student learning and achievement data to inform improvements and advance equitable outcomes.</li> <li>• Standard 3: The institution organizes its staffing and allocates its physical, technological, and financial resources to improve its overall effectiveness and promote equitable student success.</li> <li>• Standard 4: Governance roles and responsibilities are delineated in widely distributed policies, and institutional decision-making processes provide opportunities for meaningful participation and inclusion of relevant stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<b>Review of Committee Charge and Purpose</b>	<p>The committee reviewed the charge, purpose, and membership and made suggestions to update. The changes suggested will be updated and presented to the committee in the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Committee Charge:</b>  <i>The Accreditation Steering Committee serves as a shared governance group that oversees the accreditation process for San Bernardino Valley College in conjunction with the San Bernardino Community College District. The committee is responsible for developing, monitoring, and coordinating the accreditation process to support the continual improvement of student learning, institutional effectiveness, and integrated</i></p>



## Accreditation and Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Agenda Items	
	<p><i>planning. Members are to become experts on accreditation policies and standards and serve as resources to the college.</i></p> <p><i>The Outcomes Faculty Lead will chair an ad-hoc Outcomes subcommittee of Accreditation Steering Committee with the goal of creating a charge, membership, and processes and becoming an independent committee by 2024/2025.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was suggested to change “shared governance” to “participatory governance” and to add “equitable” before “student learning”. It was also suggested to rename the committee from the Accreditation Steering Committee to the Accreditation Committee.</li><li>• It was also suggested to fix the outcomes date from 2024/2025 to 2026/2027.</li></ul> <p><b>Committee Purpose:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>Be active resources to the College and Board of Trustees regarding the accreditation process.</i></li><li>2. <i>Assist with training for faculty, staff, management, and students with regard to accreditation standards, policies, and procedures.</i></li><li>3. <i>Develop timelines and goals to recommend policies and procedures for the on-going accreditation process.</i></li><li>4. <i>Review, compile, organize, and analyze evidence for reports.</i></li><li>5. <i>Review and provide input for all accreditation reports, including the ISER, mid-term, and follow-up reports.</i></li><li>6. <i>Be inclusive and encourage participation from Campus and District ex-officio groups listed below when developing and reviewing Accreditation reports.</i></li><li>7. <i>Recommend the appointment of an accreditation report editor.</i></li><li>8. <i>Prepare for the accreditation team visit and participate, as needed.</i></li><li>9. <i>Provide input on the Accreditation Manual by reviewing guidelines and making recommendations on best practices.</i></li><li>10. <i>Serve as the campus conduit for decision-making by forwarding information to appropriate committees.</i></li></ol> <p><b>Committee Membership:</b></p> <p><i>Membership is comprised of at least 3 Vice Presidents or their designees (as appointed by the President), at least one faculty member per division, at least 2 classified staff members (as appointed by Classified Senate/CSEA), and one student.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There was some discussion on the Ex-Officio members and whether the Program Review Chair should be a voting member on the committee.</li></ul>
<b>Choose Standard Team Format</b>	<p>Celia asked the committee what type of format that should be followed when it comes to evaluating and writing the rough draft of ISER. It was proposed to follow the model from last year:</p> <p>Tri-chair format (admin, faculty, classified) Writing teams of 7-9</p> <p>However, after some discussion, the committee decided the model used for the mid-term report would work best moving forward:</p> <p>1 Chair per standard</p>



## Accreditation and Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes

Agenda Items	
	Writing teams of 4-5 team members
<b>Upcoming Meetings</b>	02/24/2025 03/10/2025 03/24/2025
<b>Next Meeting:</b>	02/24/2025
<b>Adjournment:</b>	12:04 p.m.