**AIQ Membership:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Member** | | **Attendance** |
| **Co-Chairs** | Vacant (Faculty Chair) | |  |
| Ximena Ortega (Classified Chair) | | x |
| Jessica Wojtysiak (Admin Chair) | | x |
|  |  | |  |
| **Admin Rep** | Kim Arbolante | | x |
| Leo Ocampo | | x |
| Sooyeon Kim | | x |
| Kristin Rabe | | x |
| Jessica Wojtysiak | |  |
|  |  | |  |
| **Classified Rep** | Maria Arias | | X |
| Robert Dean | |  |
| Tanisha Gonzalez | |  |
| Ali Nikmanesh | | X |
| Rima Bhakta | | X |
|  |  | |  |
| **Strategic Directions Co-Chair, or Designee** | Kristin Rabe | | X |
|  |  | |  |
| **Faculty Rep** | Ricardo Garza | *Assessment Committee* | X |
| Kimberly Nickell | *Program Review* | X |
| Sondra Keckley | *Library* | X |
| ~~Grace Commiso~~ | *~~Counselor~~* |  |
|  |  |  |
| Laura Boots-Haupt | *Agriculture, Nutrition & Culinary Arts* | x |
| Laura Miller | *Agriculture, Nutrition & Culinary Arts* | X |
| Talita Pruett | *Arts, Humanities & Communication* | X |
| Matthew Meerdink | *STEM* |  |
| Ricardo Garza | *STEM* | X |
| *Vacant* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Student Reps** | Raya Arafah | SGA, Vice President |  |
| Joseph Cornejo | SGA, Rep | X |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Members At-Large** | Lysander Ramos | OIE | X |
| Jacob Rodriguez | OIE |  |
| Grace Commiso | Dean of Instruction | X |

**Agenda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |
| 1. **Minutes Review** | | | 5 minutes |
| 1. AIQ Unapproved Minutes – February 25, 2025   Motion to approve by Talita, 2nd by Sondra, passed unanimously   1. Notes/Snack Schedule - | | |  |
| 1. **Chairs Report: Accreditation Update** | | | 15 minutes |
| 1. Open forum (discussion: all)   All employees besides the executive team were invited to share with the peer review team.   1. Meet and Greet 3/17/25   Executive team members introduction with the peer review team. No discussions were held only the timeline was presented for the rest of the peer review process.   1. Current Status   Received opportunity to provide additional evidence for two areas of potential core inquiries.   * Standard 2.9 involving the use of data and program review to drive innovation in particular in the student services areas. – compiled several pieces of evidence and an additional narrative * RSI – only 3 individuals have been made aware of the CRNs reviewed.   + Dan Hall – Canvas administrator pulled screenshots of interactions through inboxes as that is not included in the shells. He also looked to see how many had participated in the EDUC NC series for online teaching. Unfortunately, only half of the sample had completed the series.   + Grace Commiso – Faculty starfish lead pulled progress report and tracking items reports, unfortunately only half had participated in progress reports and utilizing tracking items to flag or refer students through starfish.   + Matthew Jones – Academic Technology faculty hired to provide an internal review through the lens of the ACCJC rubric, this is in progress now.   Core inquiries came in a week later:   * Standard 1.2 & 1.3: the team would like to explore further the institution’s use of institution set standards and equitable outcomes. Possible area for a commendation * RSI: BC did not meet the minimum of standards (85% compliance). New business item discussion below. | | |  |
| 1. **Committee Reports:** | | | 10 minutes |
| 1. Program Review Report (Nickell)   Sending out PR to the chairs and administrative units. Last year is provided with a template of this year’s cycle. In the body of the message they ask if there are others that should receive the message and to respond that they received it. Links to resources to help them think through what they may need moving forward. | | |  |
| 1. Assessment Report (Garza)   Assessments are going through with SLOs. Program review deadline has been met. SLO plans are being processed and departments are already updating theirs.  ILO #4 Engage, we need artifacts by the end of April. | | |  |
| 1. **New Business:** | | | 30 minutes |
| 1. Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) Discussion:   What we have already done to address this:   * Discussion on POCR certification model. This is a limited subset of courses/departments therefore would need to be scaled significantly to make an impact. * An academic technology faculty member assigned to review and score the sample against the rubric. * Academic technology workshops scheduled to assist faculty with meeting standards for online instruction. * Adjusted all online sections to no greater than 45 seats moving forward (not uncommon for online sections to run with upwards of 65 seats previously) * Encouraging additional EDUC B31NC courses. Will look to add sections for the summer and encourage faculty interested in teaching online to participate. * DE taskforce: creation of a DE handbook. Timeline is to have it completed by the end of the term. Best practices are being looked at across the state. One in particular that had a clear comprehensive handbook was College of the Canyons. The hope is to have it drafted and then a flex workshop in the Fall. Looking for something sustainable and that can help change the culture. Checks and balances? Can we have individuals who are responsible to look at shells for approval? Much like the accessibility as a model. We had a taskforce who provided recommendations but we need to be sure we understand what the recommendations are and how to meet them. Certify “xyz”, how does one get certified, etc.?   Recommendations for senate moving forward:   * It was shared that Department Chair Angela Bono – sent a message to the COMM department after FCDC recommending the following:   + Send out weekly announcements about course content for the week   + Provide meaningful feedback in the speed grader box for student assignments   + Send messages to students using the “message students who” feature. We can now do this through the new data analytics feature as well for any assignment.   + Schedule weekly discussion assignments – comment within the discussion a few comments to encourage interactions (the discussion here was that we just need to have students interactions on a predictable and regular basis therefore weekly is not necessary but demonstrate it is regularly scheduled, for example maybe every other week or at critical times in the curriculum)   + Complete starfish progress reports   + Have a communication policy in your syllabus and/or home page and stick to it * Additionally: support technology tools such as Pronto that can communicate with canvas to pull the RSI information so that it is not a manual pull of screenshots of inboxes.   Motion to send these aforementioned recommendations to senate by Kim N. second by Talita, passed unanimously. Talita and Jessica will present at senate 3/26/25   * Additional conversation also took place on incorporating training within onboarding processes, especially for any faculty teaching online courses. This is an ongoing conversation.   Resource: [ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education - November 2024](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/ACCJC-Quality-Continuum-Rubric-for-Distance-Education-November-2024.pdf) | | |  |
| 1. **Unfinished Business:** | | | 30 minutes |
| 1. Institution Set Standards (ISS) Final Review   Tabled till next meeting | | |  |
| Meeting adjourned:  Next Meeting: | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Review of Mission:**  Mission Statement | **Date**:  10/22/2024 | **Review of Core Values:**  Learning  Integrity  Wellness  Diversity  Community  Sustainability | **Date**:  10/22/2024  11/13/2024  12/3/2024  01/28/2025  02/11/2025  02/25/2025 |