Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes

September 14, 2011, 2:00pm-3:30pm.

Attendees: Keith Curry, Ann Garten, Jeanie Nishime, Saul Panski, Barb Perez, Rachelle Sasser, David Vakil, Daniel Villanueva. Guests: Toni Wasserberger (faculty), Thomas Henry (Special Trustee). Notetaker: David Vakil.

Handouts:
- Minutes from past two meetings
- Subcommittee reports for subcommittees 1, 2, 3, and 5.
- Eligibility report language updates for subcommittees 1 and 4.

Action items and highlights
1. Minutes for June 8, 2011 and August 10, 2011 were approved.
2. Special Trustee Tom Henry was introduced and he made some comments.
3. Each subcommittee's written report was discussed. Some highlights include:
   o Administrative capacity (criterion #5) requires all college functions to be handled by Compton; current staffing is not sufficient.
   o Student Learning and Achievement (#10) metrics need to be expanded.
   o Documents linking SLO assessments (#10) to institutional improvements will not be ready before Spring 2013.
   o Several student services (#14 & #15) functions are currently provided by ECC on behalf of the Center; these should be provided by Compton.
   o Both of the Financial Integrity criteria (#17 and #18) have significant items of concern. Subcommittee co-chairs will re-evaluate language in the eligibility report.
   o Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation (#19) must be better linked. Documents showing this linkage will not be ready before Spring 2013.
   o A staffing plan will need to be part of the eligibility report. The staffing plan will be ready sometime during the 2012-2013 academic year.
4. For the Public Forum, each subcommittee should modify their report into the 21-criteria grid and provide a one paragraph summary.
5. Forum will be presented by subcommittee chairs and members.

Additional Minutes from the meeting follow below.

<u>Special Trustee introduction and comments</u>

Tom Henry was introduced. He noted that two of his primary charges were fiscal stability and accreditation. But his top priority will be to keep the doors open for students, faculty, staff, and the community. Accreditation of an independent college is a second priority to keeping the doors open.

Mr. Henry discussed the process required by ACCJC to take the Compton Center from a center in the El Camino College District (ECCD) to an accredited college in the Compton Community College District (CCCD): first, the Center must be accredited as a college in ECCD; second, a "substantive change" must be accepted by ACCJC to move the college from ECCD to CCCD.

Mr. Henry concluded by discussing several observations of improvements at the Center today compared to when he retired a few years earlier. He also mentioned accreditation successes at the institutions where he has worked since retiring.

Subcommittee discussion of written reports
Subcommittee 1 – Organization
The subcommittee's new report was distributed. Criterion #1 (Authority) will be updated to include the Substantive Change Report authorizing a Center. Criterion #3 (Governing Board) will include an update of the ECC Board of Trustees biographies. Criterion #4 (Chief Executive Officer) lists President Fallo as the CEO; this section may need to be updated to include the intended CEO when the Center becomes a College. Criterion #5 (Administrative Capacity) lists some functions handled by ECC employees that are funded by Compton. The ASC felt there is not currently sufficient staff to administer all functions of a college. Examples include: curriculum office and many gaps that have been identified in the student services areas. The Student Services unit plan identifies these needs. The appropriate staffing requirements should be well documented in a hiring plan. The current staffing plan will be reviewed by the subcommittee and brought to the next ASC meeting. Criterion #6 (Operational Status) will be updated with the most recent enrollment information.

Subcommittee 2 – Faculty and Instruction
Criterion #10 (Student Learning and Achievement) has been problematic, but progress has been made. The institution still needs one year to demonstrate that SLO assessments have resulted in documented changes. ASC members suggested the Academic Senate take a leading role on how to document these changes. Barb Perez, Saul Panski, and David Vakil will meet to elaborate on this documentation. The subcommittee feels the required documentation will not be completed until Spring 2013.

Subcommittee 3 – Student Services and Public Information
Criterion #14 (Student Services) lists many functions currently performed by ECC on behalf of the Center. For example, some assessment exams are not given at the center, there is no test for learning disabilities, and services for the hard of hearing must be strengthened. While the criterion is currently met when considering the resources available through ECC, the functionality is limited if the Center were to become the only college in the CCCD. Similar concerns exist for criterion #15 (Admissions). Criterion #16 (Information and Learning Resources) is met, but there are concerns regarding library collections and staffing. When the LRC building opens, these issues will become even more important. Criterion #20 (Public Information) is met. A long term plan should include a public information officer, but currently required publications are done readily.

Subcommittee 4 – Financial Integrity
Co-chair Daniel Villanueva distributed the latest language for his subcommittee's eligibility report. The "line of credit" item refers to having less than 5% reserves at the end of 2009-2010. While the Financial Resources criterion (#17) is met while the Center is part of ECCD, the eligibility report says "CCCD: Perhaps, with the exception of funding of:…." The ASC noted the exceptions were significant. The ASC expressed similar concerns for the Financial Accountability criterion regarding recent audit findings.

Furthermore, other subcommittees' reports indicate the budget does not adequately support learning. The Accreditation Steering Committee suggested replacing language in the eligibility report from "the criteria are met with the exception of …" to "the criteria are not met because…" The subcommittee co-chairs were urged to re-evaluate their report in this context.

Subcommittee 5 – Planning and Evaluation
The Center has undertaken a major effort to develop the Educational Master Plan (EMP). The next step is to show how other plans are integrated with the EMP. Also, the institution must create an evaluation process that documents links between plans, budgets, and the planning and budgeting cycle. This documentation would not be ready before Spring 2013.

Planning for Public Forum
The ASC agreed the forum should proceed as planned on October 25. Each subcommittee should modify their reports from this meeting to fit into the 21-criteria grid that David Vakil will distribute to subcommittee chairs. In addition to this modification, each subcommittee's report should be summarized in one paragraph.

The updated eligibility report document will be uploaded and publicized on the Portal (MyECC).

Subcommittee chairs and members of each subcommittee will co-present during the forum. Each subcommittee chair is asked to solicit members to co-present with the chair(s).

Jeanie Nishime, Barb Perez, and Rachelle Sasser will create a skeleton report that lists staffing needs for the Center, and will present this report during the forum.

Special Trustee Tom Henry and possibly President Fallo will close the discussion. CEO Curry will follow up on this item.

After the forum, the third version of the "Process to Accreditation" document will be distributed that reflects any changes discussed or requested in the public forum.