



Meeting Notes
District-Wide Accreditation Coordination (DAC) Council
Friday, April 29, 2021
4:30 pm – 5:30 pm

Attendees:

Mike Ansell, John Chan, Rajeev Chopra, Heather Clements, Elena Cole, Ronald Gerhard, Cynthia Gordan da Cruz, Deonne Kunkel Wu, Stuart McElderry, Elizabeth McWhorter, David Rodriguez, Rajinder Samra, Sui Song, Nadia Taylor, Stacy Thompson, Heidi Ulrech, Kristina Whalen, Estella Sanchez

Meeting Agenda:

1. Standard III and IV language from the District
2. District Support for Editing and Designing ISER Document
3. Request for Different ISER Due Date
4. Method and Timeline for College Review
5. Next Meeting

1. Standard III and IV language from the District

Ron open the meeting and spoke on Standard III and IV language for the District. He mentioned that IT CTO has been working with the Tech Committees of the Colleges to embed language that supports the report writing. Standard III-D, VC Nicholas has sent draft reports of draft language to the Vice Presidents of Administration at each College for review and embedding. Standard IV-C and D, Ron stated that he has picked up the report writing, which is in final draft and with the Board of Trustees for their feedback and comments before he sends it out to the Colleges.

2. District Support for Editing and Designing ISER Document

Kristina asked if resources used for the Educational Master Plans would also be available for the document. Ron responded to Kristina and indicated with the budget that remains from the Educational Master Plans and Strategic Plan the funds will be used to support the Colleges. He also mentioned that he will connect with Kristina and Stacy to see who they would like to reach out for editing and designing purposes.

3. Request for Different ISER Due Date

Stacy indicated due to the short timeline of the new process that Chabot requested for a different ISER due date and were told no. Kristina mentioned that Las Positas College had discussion to submit their ISER after the January due date, therefore; Dyrell reached out to the Liaison who indicated they need to submit it by December 15, which meant the second reading would be on the November Board of Trustees agenda. Rajinder noted that he understands the new process and questioned if ACCJC were wanting the report or were they requiring it on the said date. He also indicated that we would like to give the report in the same year that it's due. Ron question Kristina if a response was received from Kevin. Kristina responded that Kevin had not been approached a second time. She also mentioned that both President Sperling and Foster have spoken to join arms together and would approach ACCJC about the timeline that their requesting in hopes we could submit the report a day or two after the January Board, which has not happened yet.

Ron stated the agenda item as information for now until we hear back from the Commission.

4. Method and Timeline for College Review

Kristina requested the timeline for College review be discussed, as the timeline indicates that the College ISERS be ready for Shared Governance review in July, however; most of the constituents are not back and question if we are working on the calendar together or doing it separately.

Ron questioned what was the practice of the timeline the last time the ISER was prepared and submitted. He then mentioned that his understanding was the Colleges had their own vetting processes in timelines which he read from documents, as he was not present during the last time.

Stacy confirmed that the Colleges did have their own process, as well as timelines. She also mentioned that it was a different process for the mid-term report, as she recalled the reports were shared with each other but not with the last ISER. Being that Deonne was present during the last ISER, Stacy questioned Deonne if she remembered what took place during that time.

Deonne indicated that there was no coordination with each other and that she would appreciate reading through, as they're in the process of editing and integrating the District pieces which will take time.

Elena stated that she was present during the last ISER and working together as two different entities was not a model for moving forward. She then mentioned that its best to look at the model used during the mid-term report and do what makes sense to avoid any delays of the timeline.

Kristina mentioned that she agrees with Deonne on sharing our drafts with each other to end up with a better document, however; doesn't see that happening if the ISER is due to be ready in July.

Ron indicated if the ISER is due to be ready in July or August it would move based on the submission date of December to January and doesn't think that the movement of dates are in coordination with each other to allow as much time as possible.

Nadia agreed with Ron that it makes sense and stated if Faculty is to review the document, that doing so outside of their contract period doesn't seem wise.

Ron stated that we will revisit the timeline for College Review and ISER due date at a future meeting once we hear back from Kevin. He then went over the process and dates that the ISERs will be virtually reviewed during a half day meeting by the Commission teams. February 22, 2022 is the review date for the District, February 23, 2022 is the date for Chabot College and February 24, 2022 is the date for Las Positas College with focus visits to be the week of October 10.

5. Next Meeting

Ron requested that a Doodle Poll be sent out to determine the next meeting before May 10, 2021.