

Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes

February 2, 2011, 2pm-3:30pm

Attendees: Francisco Arce, Lawrence Cox, Ann Garten, Jo Ann Higdon, Jeanie Nishime, Saul Panski, Estina Pratt, Rachelle Sasser, Chelvi Subramaniam, David Vakil, Pieter Van Niel, Daniel Villanueva. Notetaker: David Vakil.

Handouts:

- Each subcommittee provided a written draft of its eligibility criteria assessment. Some subcommittees included separate supplementary information about their assessments.

Action items and highlights

1. Minutes of previous meeting were approved as written, with one abstention.
2. The next meeting will be on Wednesday, March 9 from 2-3:30pm.
3. Subcommittees should note which functions in their areas are performed by people at ECC rather than Compton, to address deficiencies in “Administrative Capacity,” criterion 5. A chart listing current administrative structures and a planned organizational chart need to be developed.
4. The Accreditation Steering Committee identified deficiencies with criteria 5 (administrative capacity), 10 (student learning and achievement), and 19 (institutional planning and evaluation), and had concerns or questions about criteria 16 (information and learning resources), 17 (financial resources), and 18 (financial accountability).
5. Eligibility criteria that rely on ECC should have the associated Board Policies for CCCD in place by the start of the Self-Study Report.
6. Written, detailed action plans by each subcommittee addressing concerns and deficiencies in the eligibility criteria should be submitted to the ASC co-chairs by February 25 so they can be distributed in time for the next meeting on March 9.
7. ASC members should read the full eligibility report and provide comments.
8. Subcommittee chairpersons should send their reports and documents from this meeting to the ASC chairs for compilation and assimilation into one master document.
9. Senior management, possibly jointly with ECC’s leadership, will take the lead to assign tasks to appropriate people identified in the detailed written action plans (see #5 above).
10. Discussion about the target date for submitting the eligibility report was postponed until the committee can review the action plans.
11. Dr. Cox will update the faculty on the work done by the Accreditation Steering Committee thus far.

Additional Minutes from the meeting follow below.

Subcommittee reports

Subcommittee 1 – Organization

- Criterion 1) Authority: granted via ECC; meet criterion.
- Criterion 2) Mission: ECC's mission satisfies this criterion.
- Criterion 3) Governing Board: Meet this criterion both through ECC's Board and the Board of Trustees for the Compton Community College District.
- Criterion 4) CEO: Meet this criterion via Dr. Cox for CCCD and Dr. Fallo for ECC.
- Criterion 5) Administrative Capacity: several administrative positions and functions are currently performed or coordinated by ECC rather than Compton, particularly in student services. Compton is also currently missing administrative capacity in the accounting manager and budget analyst positions. A chart listing current administrative structures and a planned organizational chart need to be developed. Compton may need to create a plan to transition Compton from a center ECC to an independent college.
- Criterion 6) Operational Status: Meet this criterion through ECC's operation.

Subcommittee 2 – Faculty and Instruction

- Criterion 7) Degrees: meet criterion through ECC's degrees.
- Criterion 8) Educational programs: meet criterion through ECC's programs.
- Criterion 9) Academic Credit: meet criterion through ECC's courses.
- Criterion 10) Student Learning and Achievement: do not meet this criteria. Much more work must be done with Student Learning Outcomes, including all program-level assessments and many course-level assessments. The Spring flex day should move us forward in these areas. We expect to meet the criteria in June 2012 and to be able to demonstrate SLO proficiency at that time. In addition to SLO assessment, we also need to track students who complete programs.
- Criterion 11) General Education: meet criterion through ECC.
- Criterion 12) Academic Freedom: meet criterion through ECC's Board Policy and the CCCD faculty contract language.
- Criterion 13) Faculty: meet this criterion. Faculty meet the state minimum qualifications and most also meet the stricter ECC minimum qualifications. The accreditation eligibility document can refer to the state and ECC minimum qualifications and the college catalog rather than listing each qualification in the document itself.

Subcommittee 3 – Student Services and Public Information

- Criterion 14) Student Services: meet this criterion. A handout listed services available to students. Categorical funding pays for many of these programs.
- Criterion 15) Admissions: meet this criterion via ECC.
- Criterion 16) Information and Learning Resources: it is unclear if we meet this criterion. This topic is being further explored by the subcommittee.

Criterion 20) Public Information: meet this criterion as documented in the handout provided by Professor Odanaka.

The subcommittee also reported concerns about Admissions, criterion 15. Many admissions services for Compton are performed at ECC, including transcript evaluation and applications through CCCApply. See the handout with a chart listing other examples. For the Financial Aid office, it was suggested a similar but more specific list of needs be developed to assess what personnel, supplies, software, and other needs exist at Compton but are currently addressed by ECC.

Subcommittee 4 – Financial Integrity

Criterion 17) Financial Resources: it is uncertain if we meet this criterion. The fiscal situation at Compton is more tenuous than at ECC. Compton has significant needs in facilities, in the fiscal office, and in the ITS department, and other areas also have needs. There are also issues with scheduled maintenance and capital outlay projects. Comparing Compton to the few other comparably-sized colleges may be helpful, but Compton also must spend \$1.2 million annually to repay loans, which is a significant financial burden for an institution of this size.

Criterion 18) Financial Accountability: meet this standard. The CCCD has two years of timely audits. However, we also have many comments in audits that would be worrisome to accreditors.

The Financial Integrity subcommittee summarized its findings on a handout.

Subcommittee 5 – Planning and Evaluation

Criterion 19) Institutional Planning and Evaluation: we do not meet this criterion. We are missing a central Education Plan. We also do not currently have an evaluation tool in place. However, Compton employees have participated in planning and vision-development summits.

We need an Education Plan. The timeline for developing this plan is being under construction but includes an anticipated Education Plan completion at the end of Spring 2011 and adoption by the Board of Trustees in August. We will work with the existing staffing plans.

There may be divisional summits.

Next Steps

Where Compton relies on ECC's umbrella to meet the accreditation eligibility requirements, we must plan to adopt the required Board Policies at CCCD no later than when we begin writing a Self-Study for accreditation candidacy. We also must inform people about what the policies and associated procedures are, so the policies are used on a day-to-day basis.