

Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 20, 2019 | Academic Affairs Conference Room

Meeting began at 10:02 a.m.

Present: Ms. Karen Daar; Ms. Michelle Fowles; Mr. Jonathan Hooker; Dr. Nakamura for Dr. Ruby Christian-Brougham; Mr. Tom Lopez; Mr. Florentino Manzano; Mr. Joshua Miller; Dr. Denise Nolden; Ms. Jeanne Owens; Dr. Sally Raskoff; Ms. Sarah Song; Ms. Hanh Tran

Not in Attendance: Mr. Mike Lee

1. Measurements of Progress on Activities for Quality Focus Essay (QFE) Action Projects

- A draft of the Midterm Report will be in development this spring and summer based on the timeline discussed at the last meeting. It is expected the completed report will be available for the District Committee of Student Success and Institutional Effectiveness and ultimately, to the Board, for consideration and adoption by spring.
- K. Daar commented that the college's Midterm Report does not require responses to the recommendations for compliance that were noted at the District level as required in the Follow-up Report. However, the Campus will need to include updates on recommendations for improvement within the Midterm Report.
- An accreditation Sharepoint is available. Items for submission may be sent directly to M. Fowles.
- K. Daar shared the revised QFE tracking tool with attendees and asked them to complete their areas and submit to M. Fowles before the next meeting.
- K. Daar reviewed College Recommendation #1 (SLO-Related Activities) information from M. Jordan, including evidence. A suggestion was made to add an Areas of Evidence column to the template.
- D. Nolden noted information received from the ACCJC that morning regarding changes to the Comprehensive Review. She suggested reviewing the Midterm Report process thoroughly and aligning expectations at this time.
- J. Miller shared discussion that took place at a Guided Pathways meeting yesterday relating to SLOs and ensuring learning, stressing the need to reframe the dialogue to include an ongoing connection between assessments and student learning. D. Nolden added that students who are engaged and active participants in their learning are more likely to be completers and will positively affect funding. K. Daar agreed, adding that Program Review and its assessments do not always capture student learning. A good model for documenting dialogue and linking assessment of SLOs to funding has not yet been fully developed. M. Fowles shared that Program Review is designed to capture program outcomes, but that the SLO Committee has been looking at shifts in assessment toward program-level SLOs.
- S. Raskoff-shared the QFE tool that she and J. Owens completed. Some items were added and others modified to reflect current status.

2. Past, Present and Future Activities Related to Visiting Team’s Recommendations for Improvement

- S. Song reported that the online marshal training being created at the District level is not yet available.
- T. Lopez reported that custodial issues have been discussed at the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). Custodians were supposed to have been hired, but this has not happened yet. Mark Strauss, CPT Director, has made presentations to Facilities Planning Committee (FPC) about the bond program, which has helped the committee in taking on a more active role.
- Facilities modules have been reviewed and modified as needed. T. Lopez shared that a centralized scheduling tool is still needed on campus, and that it will save money in terms of efficiency. Software such as Schedule 25 has been discussed, but it is cost prohibitive. S. Song shared that it is approximately \$100,000 for the initial implementation, plus maintenance costs. F. Manzano suggested the District support this expenditure across all campuses and align the purchase with the bond. M. Fowles suggested shifting the request narrative to the District. K. Daar reminded committee members that requests such as this need to go through the shared governance process to be added to Program Review as a resource item in order to be carried through as an action item.
- M. Fowles suggested that participants identify responsible parties and emphasized the importance of always responding directly to the ACCJC’s recommendations. K. Daar designated responsible parties for the visiting team’s recommendations for improvement: #1-M. Jordan; #2-K. Daar; #3-S. Song; #4-S. Raskoff, J. Owens.
- Discussion on a total cost of ownership model (College Recommendation 3) took place. D. Nolden added that a specific plan needs to be developed that reflects total cost of ownership that includes the cost of the item, as well as maintenance, staffing considerations, etc. L. Nakamura commented that progress toward meeting this recommendation has been slow due to budget limitations. D. Nolden asserted that things have changed. The College is now in a position to review how money was spent and how it can be spent more effectively. T. Lopez added that there are many different funding sources: grants, District, operating budgets, etc. that sometimes get overlooked. M. Fowles asserted that these institutional priorities need to be set, however, so that when the money is available, the College can be ready to take action. D. Nolden commended the College for having resolved its deficit issue and having its debt eliminated. She continued that LAVC is in a good place to start prioritizing, developing, and planning for new funding that will be available very soon.

3. Progress on College’s Identified Action Plan to “Explore Ways to Further Involve Adjunct Faculty in Campus Life”

- L. Nakamura suggested offering a financial incentive to adjuncts for their participation. J. Miller responded that there are adjuncts working on Zero Textbook Costs (ZTC) grants receiving compensation.
- K. Daar offered flex credit as another example of existing opportunities for adjuncts. S. Raskoff shared that adjuncts have been well-represented at the annual Technology Festival as well as participants on the newly formed Professional Development Advisory Committee. Adjuncts are invited to a yearly Adjunct Orientation. J. Miller confirmed

that adjuncts are active in the Academic Senate, but suggested that the Office of Professional Development develop further adjunct-focused activities as well, such as an adjunct appreciation day event.

- T. Lopez asked if adjuncts would like to be a part of the Building Marshal program.
- F. Manzano added that there is no identified action plan for adjunct participation at this time, and that adjunct-only activities need to be developed. F. Manzano pointed out that, similar to classified staff, adjunct faculty participation in campus activities is voluntarily. What mechanisms do we have to ensure their participation? K. Daar suggested that College Hour could be used more effectively, possibly expanding on its basic form to include adjuncts specifically.

4. College Goals and Midterm Stretch Goals

- M. Fowles stated that some goals are for licensure, program completion, etc. and that the ACCJC is now asking for data in a very specific way. The Annual Report has not been distributed yet, but it appears likely that the College will need to provide stretch goals for each program.

5. Recirculation of Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair Announcement

- The position announcement was recirculated to faculty yesterday. K. Daar emphasized that the expectations for this role are very different from previous years. This position requires collaboration with the Accreditation Liaison Office (ALO) and provides great preparation for the Accreditation Self-Evaluation.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 13th, 11:30 a.m., Academic Affairs Conference Room