**AIQ Membership:**

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

**Agenda**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |
| 1. **Minutes Review** | | | 1. minutes |
| 1. AIQ Unapproved Minutes 11-12-24 - Only change was Laura Boots-Haupt was present and therefore changed and sent back. First motion Kim Arbolante and second by Kim Nickell. Everyone supported the motion, no nays and no abstains. 2. Notes/Snack Schedule (Laura Boots-Haupt) | | |  |
| 1. **Chairs Report:** | | | 1. minutes |
| 1. ACCJC RSI Pilot – We talked about it at the previous AIQ meeting. There are concerns that there is a potential situation at Mount Sac regarding regular substantive interaction (RSI). What should BC’s next step be? Should this be AIQ’s responsibility to recommend strategies, such as flex workshops, or should we pilot our own initiative by randomly selecting classes and using a rubric? The ACCJC does its review and comes to campus we could possibly show them that we have already been proactive in this area. This is being tabled until Jessica Wojtysiak is back, but we want to keep it on the radar so that we are better prepared to have this conversation. It was questioned whether starting this in the spring would be too late. Grace Commiso clarified that we are not implementing these measures, but rather suggesting that the aforementioned tactics be considered. There was a question about the experience of faculty who have gone through such a process. Sooyeon Kim asked if there are certain actions already being taken that would fulfill this documentation. Sondra Keckley spoke about the three classes she and her coworkers took and are now certified in. Laura Miller asked how we could implement this for 100% of faculty, and Kim Arbolante wondered whether this could be done through a self-evaluation. Laura Miller noted that faculty who teach online are already taking these measures and are aware of the expectations. The Asynchronous group gave a presentation about leveling up, and the key points remembered were the standards that RSI is about, according to Talita Pruett. Talita Pruett mentioned that this is not technically an ACCJC standard, so the question is whether it would be sufficient for faculty to take measures that show and model existing programs. Sondra suggested that we take a random sample to assess how we are doing. Grace Commiso agreed that it doesn’t need to be placed on all faculty, but rather on certain individuals. Kim Arbolante suggested that deans might be a good place to start, though Grace Commiso pointed out that deans don’t always oversee everything. Kim Arbolante suggested this could potentially be a flex class, and thus voluntary, so that faculty don’t feel like they’re being told how to teach, which could violate their contract. Talita Pruett reviewed the rubric and suggested that a self-evaluation might be a better option, considering that emails and announcements could serve as sufficient evidence. Talita Pruett is forwarding the rubric to AIQ. Kim Arbolante mentioned that a self-evaluation could work for the writing specialists in the writing center, who are considered professional tutors. Grace Commiso clarified that this is a recommendation from this group, but the training would be developed by a different group (not AIQ). Kim Arbolante emphasized that this shows evidence that we are trying to move forward and take better measures. Grace Commiso said she will reach out to Academic Technology to get their thoughts on the self-evaluation process. Talita Pruett mentioned a survey that Alex sent out, asking questions that provide data, which could serve as evidence and should be remembered. Talita is sharing the survey questions with the AIQ group. If Grace Commiso meets with Academic Technology, she will share her notes. Finally, Sondra Keckley raised a question about whether professional development should be more focused on classified staff, while Grace Commiso clarified that the focus should be on faculty. | | |  |
| 1. **Committee Reports:** | | | 10 minutes |
| 1. Program Review Report (Nickell) – Everyone is finishing up right now with their reading, reviews, and providing feedback. Reports have been sent to the different committees. ISIT will speak to the resource requests on February 3rd and will provide an opportunity to defend their requests. | | |  |
| 1. Assessment Report (Garza) – It is official that Ricardo oversees this, and the last meeting was canceled. There will be no more meetings at this point. The focus is on ILOs, and the plan is to review ILO-4 this spring. | | |  |
|  | | |  |
| 1. **New Business:** | | | 60 minutes |
| 1. Review of Core Value (Wellness ) – Laura Boots-Haupt states, "Can we talk about the image?" The images were created by a graphic arts faculty member and were done at the same time as the core values. Some people are suggesting that maybe a heart or a person in a yoga pose would be better for the photo, instead of a spiral. Maria Arias reads the core value wellness. “We believe health and wellness to be integral, foundational elements of learning; we understand that a holistic education improves all aspects of society and the individual, including the mind, body, and spirit; through education, we will positively impact the health of the individual, **the** natural environment**,** and the global community.” Bolded and highlighted is being requested to be added by Kim Arbolante. Spirit was questioned because we are technically not a theistic school, and there is concern about how we are fostering and supporting spirit. Kim Arbolante is suggesting that if we do want to redo the art, the students should create it, as it is what students see in those values rather than faculty. Potentially, a couple of options could be created and then voted on by students, so the focus is on what the students see, rather than what faculty see.ACCJC RSI Pilot – To discuss next time 2. Institution Set Standards (ISS) Review - Lysander Ramos gave a review, and here are some of the points he made. There were 216 responses, which is about an 18% response rate. The questions may be too general, which could explain the poor response regarding A&R and the bookstore. It was suggested that a button be added where people can choose an option indicating they don’t use the service, as this might yield better results. There was also a question about what "neither agree nor disagree" means for survey takers. Foundation and Instructional Support should be questioned more, given the poor results. The library received exceptional feedback. It was suggested that M&O be investigated due to the poor results for all three questions asked. Marketing & Public Relations could benefit from focus groups to explore the poor results for all three questions asked. The Student Success Lab and Student Information Desk should also be investigated because of poor results. The Veterans Resource Center and the Testing & Placement Center may also need to be investigated due to their poor results. The neutrality in the KCCD Office suggests that there is limited visibility to faculty. The majority of the KCCD results were poor, with many respondents answering "neither agree nor disagree." Grace Commiso is requesting a comparison to last year and, potentially, a 5-year trend, depending on whether the survey changes. The standards and departments have changed as well. It was mentioned that participants last year included song lyrics, so we need to ensure that this is monitored for this year. The presentation was not finished on 12/03/2024 and needs to be completed at the next meeting. | | |  |
| 1. **Unfinished Business:** | | | 0 minutes |
|  | | |  |
| Meeting adjourned: 4:30 pm  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 |