1. Congratulations
   M. Hernandez, on behalf of the Committee, congratulated M. Griggs on being elected Student Trustee.

2. Review of Minutes (5/8/13)
   The Minutes of May 8, 2013 were approved with the following changes:
   - Page 1, last paragraph should read “3 Eligibility Requirements.”
   - Page 2, first paragraph should read “student complaints.”

3. Actionable Improvement Plans (AIPs)
   M. Hernandez updated the Committee on the AIPs, stating that she had received evidence for several, including the draft Viability Review process and some items from J. Ramirez and others. D. Villanueva stated he would be submitting an update on the amount of funds that would be received.

   The same process will be followed for the Draft Report Recommendations. M. Hernandez stated that the Vice Presidents would be utilizing the necessary resources within their respective areas. The deadlines listed on the document were established by the College President and were recommendations, however, M. Hernandez stressed the importance of completing as many as possible this semester and those that cannot be completed, be started this Fall 13 semester. D. Montes, M. Moreno, and Z. Rodriguez-Doucette volunteered to meet and review the deadlines and progress with the VPs, and report to the Committee at the June 19 meeting.

   Angela Echeverri stated that there needed to be an oversight committee in place for the review cycle. This next cycle would be a short one, so time was critical. She stated that although initially 2015 was the date, the ACCJC had not confirmed whether it would be 2015 or 2016. A new draft set of standards is expected in July that would be organized differently, without all the subsections.

4. Membership
a. Composition

M. Hernandez presented the draft Membership list and invited discussion on the composition of the Committee.

L. Milke recommended that there be a representative from each of the Standards Committees, and that there be two representatives appointed from each Standard in order to ensure consistent representation. M. Hernandez inquired as to whether these representatives would be voting members. Committee discussion suggested that they should be a resource for the Committee rather than voting members.

L. Milke recommended that a member should come from those who were unrepresented by unions, including D. Montes, O. Ayala Sanchez and F. Nguyen. There was some discussion on how a representative would be chosen. J. Ramirez suggested that, due to the relatively small number of unrepresented employees, they should be able to informally determine a representative from their number. D. Montes stated that she would contact them and follow-up.

M. Hernandez invited discussion of the Faculty Self-Evaluation Co-Chair positions. A. Echeverri recommended that the position be opened up and advertised. Discussion included the possibility of changing the process. M. Moreno suggested that the position be advertised, and if there were no openings, then no one needed to be selected, but there would be a potential pool upon which to draw if needed. L. Milke recommended that an advertisement for the position be sent out as soon as possible. A. Echeverri recommended that the Committee wait until after the report came out before making a decision. M. Hernandez stated that she would work with Dr. Perez and D. Villanueva to discuss generating and distributing an advertisement.

L. Milke inquired as to who the ALO should be. S. Atkinson-Alston stated that the ALO is usually the Vice President of Academic Affairs. A. Echeverri stated that there were no written rules as to who could be an ALO. M. Moreno suggested that D. Villanueva remain ALO for continuity’s sake. D. Villanueva stated that the ALO was selected at the discretion of the President, but that he’d be willing to serve in any capacity necessary. M. Hernandez stated that ASC leadership will discuss this with the President and re-visit this issue in July.

Discussion about continuity and consistency with its membership and co-chairs was also addressed. The Committee stated that the ALO does not have to be tied
to Co-Chair duties. This will be discussed and membership composition for the next cycle in the June meeting.

5. Charter
   a. Purpose
      M. Hernandez presented the Draft Charter for the Committee, pointing out that although historically the Committee’s purpose was to prepare the Self Evaluation Report, the role has changed out of necessity and expanded to include overseeing the progress of the Actionable Improvement Plans as well as the Draft Report Recommendations, and eventually, the Commission’s Report Recommendations. L. Milke agreed, stating that the Committee needed to remain viable to follow up on results of the AIP. P. Flood pointed out that there were 25 Actionable Improvements on the AIP that needed to be tracked and monitored, requiring a new role for the Committee. It was agreed that the committee will meet at a minimum, once per month.

   b. Campus Role/Involvement
      M. Hernandez stressed the need for accountability on the part of the campus community, and that presenting a report to the Committee rather than simply providing information for the Committee helped to foster a sense of personal accountability. L. Milke concurred, stating that if someone knew they needed to prepare and present a regular progress report to the Committee, it would help keep them on track.

      J. Ramirez stated that the tone of the ASC to the campus community should be to make it clear that it is the privilege of everyone on campus to participate in the opportunity to make the College a better place. M. Moreno stated that the Accreditation process was important to all members of the community.

6. Upcoming Accreditation Cycle
   a. Timeline
      M. Hernandez presented a copy of the previous Timeline for the Self Evaluation as a guide for creating a new draft Timeline. She pointed out that due to the changes in the Standards it was difficult to set up and finalize a timeline, but that it would be possible to set up a timeline through the summer and fall. A. Echeverri recommended setting up two scenarios, one for a visit in 2015 and one for 2016.
b. Preparation and Strategies

M. Hernandez recommended that although it was not yet certain how the new Standards would be organized, basic Standard teams could be started, to be finalized once the shape of the Standards was known. At such time, full-time faculty could be assigned to work on a standard based on their expertise and/or experience. M. Hernandez also recommended the following:
- each team determine their leaders
- a regular meeting schedule be set up for all the standards.
- An ASC member be assigned to act as a liaison and allow a direct line of communication and support with the Accreditation Steering Committee.

L. Milke inquired as to whether every faculty member would be assigned or recommended, and stated that it should probably go through Academic Senate. M. Hernandez recommended that the Committee collaborate with Academic Senate to request or make recommendations for all full-time faculty to serve on a Standard Team.

A. Echeverri stated that there needed to be oversight in place for the review cycle. This next cycle would be a short one, so time was critical. She stated that although initially 2015 was the date, the ACCJC had not confirmed whether it would be 2015 or 2016.

c. Themes

M. Hernandez identified three major themes: Research and evaluation—creating an evidence based culture, audit compliance, and collegiality. She opened up discussion on these themes.

P. Flood stated there was a need for Theme Teams. After some discussion, it was agreed to create the following “theme teams”:
- Collegiality: J. Ramirez (Lead); Z. Rodriguez-Doucette, S. Atkinson-Alston, L. Milke, M.L. Mendoza, M. Griggs, M. Hernandez
- Research: A. Echeverri (Lead); M. Moreno, Sarah Masters, M. Allen, P. Flood

The ASC identified an initial team “lead” for each one to help pull the team together and call the first meeting. At that point, the theme team can determine if that person remains lead or another member takes lead.