

## Accreditation Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, October 29, 2019 | Academic Affairs Conference Room

Meeting began at 1:34 p.m.

**Members present:** Dr. Ruby Christian-Brougham; Ms. Karen Daar; Ms. Michelle Fowles; Dr. Barry Gribbons; Dr. Yih-Mei Hu; Mr. Chauncey Maddren; Mr. Florentino Manzano

**Guests:** Dr. Matthew Jordan; Mr. Tom Lopez; Ms. Jeanne Owens; Ms. Hanh Tran

**Not in Attendance:** Mr. Jonathan Hooker; Mr. Mike Lee

### 1. Review of Comments from Constituents

- K. Daar reviewed comments from the Midterm Report draft and survey that was emailed to all campus constituents. The draft was also sent to Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) members who were asked to share with constituent members.
- Feedback was received from a faculty member who had positive comments about the report but had questions about the amortization of repair and replacement costs as well as depreciation. These questions were addressed by Tom Lopez.
- Another response was received regarding the gardening workload, number of gardeners per acre, etc. K. Daar prompted the group to discuss adding this to the report. B. Gribbons asked what type of evidence this response provided to the report and how it related to the total cost of ownership (TCO) model. F. Manzano asked if there is a link between building/cost of grounds/TCO. M. Jordan suggested that the recommendation is focused on examining a model for the future – not the past. Y. Hu added that when she spoke with Sarah Song about the staffing component of the TCO, she related it to how the District embeds the maintenance cost into the building or facility by a certain amount which includes the salaries of the employees who are responsible for facility upkeep. T. Lopez commented that the District conducts a staffing study and is working on developing a staffing standard for gardening. Studies have already been conducted for custodial and maintenance. These resources can be used as tools for identifying gaps.
- K. Daar suggested sending another email to campus constituents announcing that the survey will be open until Friday, November 8<sup>th</sup>. If any additional comments are received, she will inform the Steering Committee.

### 2. Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model

- B. Gribbons asked about what it will take to be at an efficient level after the new buildings are constructed. The District models do not match LAVC's allocations. Our actual expenditures are much lower than the eight million that has been allocated. M. Fowles asked about increased efficiency of the new buildings. B. Gribbons responded that this information is not available yet. T. Lopez suggested that the group define what TCO means before proceeding. B. Gribbons stated that while our

revenue is determined by the State and the District, we determine how to allocate this revenue.

- B. Gribbons suggested a workgroup to develop the TCO model. M. Jordan and M. Fowles agreed that a workgroup would be useful. C. Maddren added that this is a transparency issue, and if we don't know, we can't communicate our findings to the college. B. Gribbons added that currently, we have a two-million-dollar deficit, and that we are overspending in some areas. We have a custodial staffing shortage, yet we may be overstaffing in other departments. As a college, we need to identify where we strive to be to so that we can navigate toward that level. A TCO model would help us to identify where that ideal would be. Y. Hu shared that the Facilities TCO from Southwest College was examined for the Report and that it is included in the evidence. B. Gribbons questioned if Southwest College was similar enough in size to LAVC and if it could be used for comparison purposes.
- K. Daar summarized that the committee would add information on gardening and landscaping as another area of staffing associated with TCO and that in the future, a workgroup would be established to develop ways to utilize information in the Midterm Report as well as hiring prioritizations. Y. Hu asked when this workgroup would begin meeting. B. Gribbons suggested that it would fit well into the priorities for the Budget Committee this year. K. Daar agreed that it would it could be emphasized as a workgroup that is part of the Budget Committee.

### **3. Data Summary Review**

- K. Daar discussed the required data summary as part of the Midterm Report. M. Fowles will add goal information, standards, and calculations for job placement. K. Daar reviewed trends listed in the Annual Report from the last three years with the group. New analysis of the data has been provided by M. Fowles. M. Fowles added that the Vision for Success goals were to be added, but the years do not align. She is now using the calculations based on the goals in the Educational Master Plan (EMP) even though they are not identical. Institutional-set standards are already available. B. Gribbons asked how this applies to the local goal setting. M. Fowles replied that, although they do not apply, in the narrative it is noted that the college has set goals through the Vision for Success on these items and that we will be looking at this as part of our strategic planning efforts this year.

### **4. SLO Assessment Reporting**

- K. Daar explained that Y. Hu and M. Jordan have been compiling Student Learning Outcome (SLO) information from last year, in terms of course and program assessment. Institutional Outcomes have not been required in the last three years, but in the previous year, seven were identified. In the previous Annual Report, we identified 100% of our courses as “ongoing assessments”.
- Y. Hu commented that courses not being offered are unable to be assessed. B. Gribbons commented that if a course is assessed a first time, then there is a continuing assessment, and it can be considered ongoing. If it has never been assessed, it cannot be considered “continuing to be assessed”. Y. Hu responded that in cycle one, all courses were assessed. B. Gribbons stated that if a course has not

been offered in five years or more, it should be archived - It cannot be assessed. M. Fowles added that action was taken in the prior cycle to achieve 100% compliance and ensure that everything that was offered was assessed. B. Gribbons asked about how this will be handled, moving forward. Y. Hu responded that according to policy, if a course is offered but not assessed, it would be subject to administrative archival. This three-year cycle ends spring 2020 and is the responsibility of each department to get this done. M. Jordan added that the assessment cycle is designed so that everything can be assessed within the first two years, with the last year for catch-up. Because we are in the middle of that cycle, we can still consider it ongoing.

#### **5. Annual Fiscal Report**

- K. Daar shared that the District typically provides this report.

#### **6. Review of Comments from Steering Committee**

- K. Daar requested any additional comments from the Steering Committee.
- C. Maddren suggested that he would like to include language in the Report that communicates campus-wide efforts to increase classified participation in the Classified Staff Development Committee and the challenges that have been experienced.
- K. Daar reminded Steering Committee members that evidence will continue to be updated as necessary to reflect the most current information available for the Report.
- The draft Midterm Report will go to the Academic Senate on November 21<sup>st</sup> for approval. It will then be presented to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) on December 3<sup>rd</sup> before it is reviewed by the District Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success (IESS) committee in January 2020. Board approval is expected in February. The completed Midterm Report will then be submitted to the ACCJC in March 2020.
- K. Daar shared that she has received news from Vice Chancellor Dr. Ryan Cornner that he will be sending out the links for the evidence that is referred to in the District portion of the Report soon.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.