

Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting

Thursday, August 29, 2019 | Academic Affairs Conference Room

Meeting began at 1:32 p.m.

Present: Ms. Karen Daar; Dr. Ruby Christian-Brougham; Ms. Michelle Fowles; Dr. Barry Gribbons; Mr. Jonathan Hooker; Dr. Yih-Mei Hu; Dr. Matthew Jordan; Mr. Mike Lee; Mr. Chauncey Maddren; Mr. Florentino Manzano; Ms. Jeanne Owens; Dr. Sally Raskoff; Ms. Sarah Song; Ms. Hanh Tran

Not in Attendance: Mr. Tom Lopez

1. Welcome Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair

- K. Daar welcomed Dr. Y. Hu as the new Accreditation Faculty Co-Chair and thanked her for her work on the Midterm Report and accreditation matters.

2. Discussion on Draft Midterm Report Content and Progress

- Discussion was held on the content of the draft Midterm Report. C. Maddren asked if it was accurate as indicated in the current draft of the Statement of Report Preparation, that all recommendations for improvement have been met. K. Daar responded that some were clearly met whereas others were hoped to be met by the time the Report was submitted to the Board. She assured the group that identifying a recommendation as met without supplying related evidence would not happen. However, work is ongoing and much has been completed.
- **College Recommendation #1** - K. Daar prompted discussion. Y. Hu and M. Jordan shared highlights: in terms of the SLO component, the recommendation has been addressed and there is plenty of evidence. Recommendations have been thoroughly assessed. Data has been disaggregated and has been built-in to the Program Review process as well as the SLO assessment process.
- R. Christian-Brougham added that the language regarding the SLO Coordinators recommendation about disaggregating demographic categories may require more thoughtful introspection to communicate the intended message.
- M. Fowles proposed that the language could instead focus on the equity groups that were decided upon.
- C. Maddren thanked the SLO Coordinators for their hard work in getting the College this far.
- **College Recommendation #2** - K. Daar stated that this recommendation has been met and the College Catalog and website now include procedures for accepting transfer credit.
- **College Recommendation #3** - Y. Hu and K. Daar offered ideas about what this recommendation is responding to. An analysis on Facilities and Information Technology by Administrative Services was distributed. Discussion ensued on what is envisioned for the future. M. Lee stated that this year, the College's operating costs are approximately \$9.51 per square foot. K. Daar asked if the Total Cost of Ownership model is being

applied to the College and if it is helping to make decisions, especially in terms of prioritization. M. Jordan suggested that more documentation may need to be included in the narrative.

- C. Maddren suggested that a plan for staffing is needed. K. Daar agreed and advocated that maintenance and upgrades could also be included. S. Song replied that operational costs should include staffing costs. C. Maddren suggested adding this to the narrative.
- **College Recommendation #4** - K. Daar thanked J. Owens and S. Raskoff for their work to meet this recommendation.
- K. Daar shared that S. Raskoff was hired as a 0.6 ISA Professional Development Coordinator through the Program 100 budget and equity funding. R. Christian Brougham asked if the campus was informed of this job position. K. Daar explained that 0.4 of the assignment was included in the Student Equity and Achievement plan (SEAP) and the job announcement was circulated to the entire faculty. The former Academic Senate President approved S. Raskoff's appointment. The 0.2 funded by Program 100 is an ongoing commitment that is provided by the campus and is renewable annually. The 0.4, 10-month portion of the assignment is funded through equity and re-evaluated each year.
- R. Christian Brougham asked about the SEAP and if the acronym could be changed, as it may have negative connotations. F. Manzano explained that the focus of SEAP is on equity and that equity should be the focus of all funding. B. Gribbons commented that the name (SEAP) could be clearer. C. Maddren suggested that the equity structure has changed and should be represented in a better way.
- C. Maddren thanked J. Owens and S. Raskoff for their work in revamping professional development opportunities for both faculty and staff.
- Y. Hu added that while the College continues in building professional development integration, it has also increased its offerings, which is part of the recommendation.
- F. Manzano suggested that the narrative language reflect more accurately how far the College has come in addressing the recommendation, especially in terms of integration efforts.
- C. Maddren stated that the request portion does not fully describe who was awarded IEPI grant money for conferences and presentations and asked how the funding is distributed. K Daar added that the Professional Development Office looks through the Program Review modules that are being represented to track overarching issues. Some requests can be funded through Career Technical Education (CTE), Perkins, etc. The College is identifying trends to allocate resources to in the future or join departments together in order to leverage funding that can benefit both departments. F. Manzano asked about the specific criteria for IEPI grant funding. B. Gribbons commented that a transparent process is needed for informing those who are funded and those who are not, including the rationale behind each decision.
- Evidence of AB705 retreats could be achieved through agendas, etc. Guided Pathways design retreats could include the agendas instead of just the emails.
- C. Maddren pointed out that the Classified Staff Development Committee is currently comprised of only a few people and needs to be expanded. In the context of this report,

it can be added as a point that is being improved upon. C. Maddren suggested the idea of a classified leadership retreat.

- J. Hooker added that District workshops directed at AFT 1521A Union members were not well attended, largely because there was no District push to encourage people to go. Furthermore, some classified staff members reported being denied when requesting permission to attend. K. Daar said that she was contacted by the District to encourage people to attend. F. Manzano agreed that the workshop emails were sent out to the Vice Presidents. J. Hooker heard from members that there was no back-up for some staff, and this was a reason for denials.
- M. Fowles commented that sign-in sheets from professional development events can be used as evidence.
- K. Daar asked about availability and access to classified professional development funding from the District. J. Hooker responded that AFT 1521A funding is available. J. Owens responded that she is unsure if additional designated District money for classified professional development has arrived at the campus yet.
- Student Services First Fridays are not offered to all classified staff members. Communication is an ongoing challenge, especially with those who do not have access to email on a regular basis, such as custodial staff. M. Fowles asked what is being done to widen communication and improve attendance at these kinds of events. R. Christian - Brougham commented that some of the unions do not even have a lead representative. M. Fowles added that there are also unrepresented staff members to be considered.
- **College Recommendation #5** - C. Maddren asked the level of input faculty has in the district meetings. K. Daar responded that faculty voices are heard, and input is appreciated.
- **College Recommendation #12** - There is currently no District meeting calendar, but it is being developed over the summer.
- **Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #1 (Student Achievement Data)** - M. Fowles reported that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) has been able to leverage funds from grants, which has led to an increase in the office staff and data output. There are now more trainings, activities, and professional development opportunities being offered.
- **Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #1 (SLO Data)** - M. Jordan reported on the progress that SLO Coordinators have made, including reviewing course outcomes, creating alignment maps for eLumen, aggregating data, analyzing program assessment data, and ensuring that program outcomes align with the Guided Pathways framework. The program assessment structure has been adjusted to reflect each degree's unique outcomes in relation to Guided Pathway objectives as well.
- **Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #2 (Safety)** - M. Lee explained that the video surveillance project is an upgrade funded by the 40J bond. Surveillance cameras need to have their server capacity increased first. B. Gribbons commented that campus signs are needed to let people know that they are being recorded in specific areas under surveillance. Y. Hu added that some non-functioning cameras have been taken down to avoid undue liability.
- B. Gribbons shared that he will be sending out a monthly status update to campus constituents on the status of the facility and bond projects.

- C. Maddren asked about regular and systematic procedures for lockdown drills and if there is a schedule for drills. S. Song replied that there is a regular, ongoing schedule.
- **Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #2 (Maintenance)** - Y. Hu explained that there are only 22 custodial positions, so there is no way to reach the standard that the District has set. Also, there was no hiring list available from the Personnel Commission. Those who have been hired have been replacements only. M. Lee stated that because of retirements, and no available list, the College has been using provisional workers until the test can be administered and a new list created. C. Maddren asked if pressure can be placed on the district to create a list. F. Manzano commented that we need 36 custodians to reach a higher level of functioning. B. Gribbons stated that the District standard may not be attainable and asked about ratios at other campuses. B. Gribbons stated that the design of facilities and the way in which areas are staffed need to be examined.
- M. Jordan commented that although the College has been going through budgetary issues, we could expand more on how we are moving forward. The current language is not positive.
- M. Fowles commented that because this is an action project, there is a need to describe what is being done to meet standards.
- **Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #2 (Information Technology)** – C. Maddren asked if the College has a process for notifying people of the status of their IT requests.
- H. Tran shared that there is not enough funding through the 40J Bond in order to complete all needed projects in relation to IT.
- Music & Art buildings are not equipped with upgraded wireless capabilities yet; focus has been on other buildings first.
- J. Hooker commented that the language referring to office computers needs to be addressed. Is it for replacement or cascading? H. Tran reported that she has never seen a line item for new office computers. Block Grant-funded replacements in student labs permitted cascading some office computers, but there is never enough money to buy all that the campus needs on an ongoing basis.
- **Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #2 (Space Utilization)** - S. Song shared that the Work Environment Committee (WEC) will be moving forward with a recommendation to raise rates on facility rentals after a fair market study has been completed.
- **Quality Focus Essay, Action Project #3 (Professional Development)** – K. Daar led the discussion on the revamping that is being done, referencing the previous improvement recommendation.
- **Changes and Plans Arising Out of the Self-Evaluation Process** – K. Daar reviewed responses regarding the gainful employment link, the Net Cost calculator, degree and certificate requirement information, the *Hiring Handbook for Selecting Faculty*, ways to involve adjunct faculty, professional development for staff, and online training opportunities.

3. Scope of Campus Distribution for Input

- K. Daar proposed that she and Y. Hu take the commentary that was provided by this committee and make the appropriate changes. It can then be sent to Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) members for distribution and review by Tier 2 committees, allowing for more feedback from constituents.

- K. Daar added that it could then be sent to the campus community through a survey to collect additional feedback.

4. Timeline for Circulating Midterm Report for Approvals

- The Midterm Report is expected to go to the Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success committee on January 17, 2020 but will need to be at the District four days prior to this.
- A finalized draft should be available for the November Academic Senate meeting.

5. Need for an Additional Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting

- K. Daar proposed another meeting in the future, possibly after receiving feedback from constituents.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:26 p.m.