

2015-16 and 2016-17 College Planning Priorities Detailed Description of Challenges and Initiatives

I. Accreditation

Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards.

Assigned Executive administrator:

Vice President of Academic Services

Detailed Description of the Planning Priority

Initial Findings from IPC:

According to the Accreditation status report from Elena Cole and Marie Smith, there is still a dire need at LPC to create an authentic, ongoing, institutionalized accreditation process. This will most likely require the formation of a standing committee. It is in our opinion that this Priority was not as effectively addressed as it needed to be, and we recommend it stay as a Priority for 2015-16.

Stakeholders Identification of Current Challenges/Barriers:

A. KEY STAKEHOLDERS: Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, and Accreditation Consultant

B. CURRENT CHALLENGES/BARRIERS TO SUCCESS:

[Prompt: As the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, and Accreditation Consultant, can you please outline the current accreditation process's challenges/ barriers to success?]

College Processes: LPC needs to continually consider accreditation standards in our work as an institution:

1. There has been an irregular collecting of evidence; no systematic process for collecting evidence; too little support in taking and posting minutes and other relevant documentation of decision-making / planning.
2. Some key college committees (i.e. College Council, SLO Committee) seem to have not consistently consulted the ACCJC standards as decisions were made, or they misunderstood them. This lead to problems with compliance.
3. The district has not worked closely with the college to address accreditation concerns. This lead to problems with compliance.
4. The college does not evaluate its processes with the regularity required by ACCJC. This lead to problems with compliance. The college needs to engage in

regular and systematic self-evaluation and be able to demonstrate continuous improvement.

The Current Process for Writing the Self-Study Report:

5. The timeline for writing the report was too short.
6. There were too few writers / team members writing the report.
7. The team had an unclear understanding of the standards based on the fact that there had been very little training of writers / leads.
8. The writers had an unclear understanding of audience as no one deeply involved in writing the report had served on a visiting team or received adequate training.
9. The technology for working on the draft was problematic, leading to miscommunication.
10. The district was unresponsive to requests from accreditation writers.
11. There was poor communication about the self-study reports between the district and both colleges.

C. RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS/STEPS:

[Prompt: As the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, and Accreditation Consultant, can you please recommended solutions/steps to addressing the challenges/barriers (if you have any)?]

1. Develop and support the systematic and regular collecting of evidence and response to standards on an annual basis. Heighten awareness of committees / relevant areas to ACCJC standards and collect self-evaluation on a regular basis.

Recommendation: Each committee / relevant areas should have to write a version of the “pre-accreditation report” annually as programs have to write program review. This should be an expectation anticipated by committee chairs and other leaders overseeing areas important to accreditation. Also, support for taking and posting minutes / other relevant evidence must be prioritized and provided.
(Addresses B.1 and B.2)

2. More communication with the district is needed on a regular basis.

Recommendation: 2 meetings annually at which administration, accreditation faculty leads (VPs / ALOs from both colleges), and Chabot accreditation faculty leads meet to assess progress toward meeting standards. Minutes are taken / a “pre-accreditation” type report is written by the Vice Chancellor and posted.
(Addresses B.3, B.10, and B.11)

3. Too little evidence of regular and systematic self-evaluation leading to continuous quality improvement.

Recommendation: The College should prioritize regular and systematic self-evaluation for key processes, considering ACCJC standards in the development of the self-evaluation tool (Staff Development needs to self-assess, for example).

Administer the accreditation surveys more regularly (maybe one every two years) and in advance of the writing of the report. (*Addresses B.4*)

4. Organization and response to accreditation issues / reports was too little, too late, and leaders lacked appropriate training.

Recommendation: The college should task a group, either a committee or point-person(s), to support the administrative ALO in addressing accreditation needs on an on-going basis. This committee (its chair) or point-person(s) should attend trainings with the ALO when possible and/or should meet with the ALO to learn of changing accreditation needs. The committee (or chair) or point-person(s) should serve on visiting teams as should any other interested staff/faculty and all administrators if possible. This committee / point-person(s) should steward the awareness of accreditation concerns and the collecting of documentation/evidence, much as is done with program review. He / she / they should set a realistic timeline for writing ACCJC reports, organize methods for collecting and posting information (along with recommending helpful technology), study best practices from other member institutions, and be a resource at key committee meetings when accreditation issues arise. He / she / they should be present at district meetings, maintaining regular contact with both the district and Chabot. They should recruit writers for ACCJC reports, mainly the mid-term, the self-study, and the annual reports well in advance of the report deadline, organizing the writing effort. (*Addresses B.5-B.9*)

D. RECOMMENDED WORDING of the PLANNING PRIORITY:

[Prompt: As the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, and Accreditation Consultant, can you please recommended wording of planning priority.]

This may be too detailed, but here it is: This will be accomplished through the collecting and posting of annual “pre-accreditation” reports written by stakeholders, the regular self-evaluation of key institutional processes, the training of key staff in accreditation best practices, and the tasking of a committee / point-person(s) to support the administration at the college and the district in communication and organization regarding the college’s accreditation needs.

Adoption of Planning Priority

This Planning Priority was adopted by the President, Dr. Barry Russell, in May 2015 with no changes.

II. Curriculum

Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.

Assigned executive administrator:

Vice President of Academic Services

Detailed Description of the Planning Priority

Initial Findings from IPC:

According to the Program Review Summaries of ALSS, STEMPS, and BSBA there is still a need for curriculum support. The Planning Priorities survey revealed that although there is widespread support for the curriculum committee itself, several respondents indicated that there had been no change in support for the committee itself (presumably they are members of the curriculum committee). One of the challenges we identified as members of IPC is that we have no process for committees to request assistance, so it is difficult for their needs to “trickle up” to the planning process unless the chairs themselves make it known. It is in our opinion that this Priority was not addressed this year, and it needs to stay as a Priority for 2015-16.

Stakeholders Identification of Current Challenges/Barriers:

A. KEY STAKEHOLDERS: Current and future curriculum committee chair

B. CURRENT CHALLENGES/BARRIERS TO SUCCESS:

[Prompt: As the current curriculum committee chair and the future curriculum committee chair, can you please outline the curriculum committee’s challenges/ barriers to success?]

1. Ever changing regulations and/or interpretations of regulations by State Chancellor’s office and campus personnel.
2. Inadequate/inconsistent support within Office of Academic Services with tracking of proposals once they have been approved by Curriculum Committee, finalizing within CurricUNET, researching of issues, maintenance of historical documents.
3. Need for additional training of faculty on curriculum development (pedagogical considerations, etc.) as well as need for additional technical training/support for faculty as proposals are developed.
4. Lack of documentation on past curriculum actions; missing documentation/files; no standardized way that documentation is maintained.

C. RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS/STEPS:

[Prompt: As the current curriculum committee chair and the future curriculum committee chair, can you please recommended solutions/steps to addressing the challenges/barriers (if you have any)?]

1. Develop a faculty reassigned position that will work directly with the Curriculum Committee Chair, faculty, the State Chancellor's office personnel, the Articulation Officer, GoverNET, and the Office of Academic Services to support the curriculum process. This position would encompass the current CurricUNET Tech Support duties as well as be a mentor for faculty working on curriculum and a specialist who can assist in getting our curriculum through the State Chancellor's office. This position would provide a one-stop place for curriculum questions, issues, training, facilitating catalog and addendum production, finalizing documentation in CurricUNET upon approval from State, etc. The position would need a significant amount of reassigned time associated with it to be able to accomplish all the tasks outlined above.
2. Staff development opportunities for workshops on curriculum development. Many faculty have never developed course outlines and may not have a background in curriculum development. With an increase in the number of new faculty and the amount of curriculum that needs to be developed/updated, it is critical that we provide this type of training.
3. Develop a process of maintaining archives of curriculum documentation, e.g., minutes, agendas, approvals from State, etc. Many of these documents are now in electronic formats but there is no single repository nor are the documents routinely backed up. Some documents are in Blackboard; some on individual hard drives/flash drives/network drives; some are hard copies. However, when research needs to be done, there is no single place to look for all documents. We need to have a single repository, which is routinely backed up, where all documents are stored and indexed for easy access.

D. RECOMMENDED WORDING of the PLANNING PRIORITY:

[Prompt: As the current curriculum committee chair and the future curriculum committee chair, can you please recommended wording of planning priority]

Necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.

Adoption of Planning Priority

This Planning Priority was adopted by the President, Dr. Barry Russell, in May 2015 with no changes.

III. Student Learning Outcomes

Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes.

Assigned executive administrator:

Vice President of Academic Services

Detailed Description of the Planning Priority

Initial Findings from IPC:

According to the Program Review Summaries for ALSS, STEMPS, and BSBA there is a need to have more part time faculty to participate in SLOs so that SLO measurements are meaningful. The Accreditation status report revealed we are far from complaint to ACCJC standards ranging from courses with no SLOs to difficulty in finding evidence as the SLO committee received no classified support. It is in our opinion that this will most likely result in a sanction from ACCJC so we recommend creating a comprehensive institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes plan as a Priority for 2015-16.

Stakeholders Identification of Current Challenges/Barriers:

A. KEY STAKEHOLDERS: Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, Accreditation Consultant, and SLO leader

B. CURRENT CHALLENGES/BARRIERS TO SUCCESS:

[Prompt: As the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, Accreditation Consultant, and SLO leader can you please outline the current challenges/barriers to success to meeting ACCJC Standards?]

The current barriers to our SLO work at LPC:

1. Insufficient time to have cross-discipline dialogue about student learning
2. Difficulty documenting SLO work in our current software system
3. Inconsistent information and a lack of training about assessing student learning
4. No process insuring the quality of SLOs

C. RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS/STEPS:

[Prompt: As the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, Accreditation Consultant, and SLO Leader can you please recommended solutions/steps to addressing the challenges/barriers (if you have any)?]

1. Dedicate time at college day and flex day to discuss best practices on SLO work and highlight what faculty are currently doing at LPC
2. Investigate ways to improve our software program used to document SLO work

3. Offer more training to part-time and full-time faculty on best practices in assessment (including training all new faculty)
4. Have SLO committee look over SLOs to ensure quality and consistency of assessment

D. RECOMMENDED WORDING of the PLANNING PRIORITY:

[Prompt: As the Accreditation Liaison Officer, Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officer, Accreditation Consultant, and SLO leader can you please recommended wording of planning priority.]

Dedicate resources to meaningful assessment of student learning.

Adoption of Planning Priority

This Planning Priority was adopted by the President, Dr. Barry Russell, in May 2015 with no changes.

III. Tutoring Services

Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE, and Transfer courses.

Assigned executive administrator:

Vice President of Student Services

Detailed Description of the Planning Priority

Initial Findings from IPC:

According to the Program Review Summary there is a need to expand Tutoring Services to both meet demand and improve student success. In addition both the Equity Plan the SSSP Plan identify the Tutorial Center as a primary area of development for achieving their goals. It is in our opinion that the Tutorial Center is key to improving Student Success across the board so we recommend expanding Tutorial Services as a Priority for 2015-16.

Stakeholders Identification of Current Challenges/Barriers:

E. KEY STAKEHOLDERS: Dean, Tutorial Center Coordinator, or RAW Center Coordinator

F. CURRENT CHALLENGES/BARRIERS TO SUCCESS:

[Prompt: As the Dean, Tutorial Center Coordinator, or RAW Center Coordinator, can you please outline the current challenges/ barriers to expanding Tutoring Services?]

The current barriers to our SLO work at LPC:

1. Staffing issues for both the Tutorial Programs Instructor/Coordinator and the Instructional Assistant.
 - a. The Tutorial Center currently staffed by one 48% temporary adjunct faculty who teaches the tutor training classes and coordinates the program and one permanent part-time (18 hour weekly) classified Instructional Assistant I.
 - b. The Tutorial Center needs a greater commitment and support from the college to provide increased hours for the Tutorial Center faculty member and staff member. The data shows growth to the point where we are over the capacity to serve with the present part-time staff.

Total Requests for Scheduled Tutoring	
2012-13	817
2013-14	894
2014-15	1104
Total Hours for all Tutoring (Drop-in, Scheduled, RAW, Prep2Pass)	
2012-13	7739

2013-14	9024
2014-15	There are still 3 weeks of tutoring left, but continued growth is indicated.
Total Student Contact Hours (Supervised Tutoring & Study time)	
2012-13	18,606
2013-14	22,120
2014-15	Anticipating a higher # this year...

- c. Even with the greatly increased numbers, the adjunct faculty member is working the same number of hours in 2014-15 school year as she was in 2000-01 when the total tutoring hours were 3,102. Since 1996 when the Tutorial Center started there has always been an adjunct instructor to teach the training classes and supervise the Center and this is no longer sufficient. This current staffing level will not allow us to serve any more students.
2. There needs to be more emphasis on basic skills and as a major component in tutoring.
 - a. Basic Skills math needs more programs to serve it at the tutorial level.
 - b. The new 3SP puts new requirements to provide services to basic skills students.
 - c. There are an increase in mandates but there is no increase in staff or budget to handle what needs to be done.
 3. Funding is a major issue for the Tutorial Center and the RAW Center. The RAW Center coordinator has 2 CAH release time per semester and could do more with more funding. Also, they put in their program review a request to institutionalize increased funding for RAW faculty tutors. The present CAH comes off the top, not from a particular division or discipline, because the tutors work with students from any discipline who brings in a paper or reading assignment, i.e. Administration of Justice, Health, History, and ESL.

G. RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS/STEPS:

[Prompt: As the Dean, Tutorial Center Coordinator, or RAW Center Coordinator, can you please recommended solutions/steps to addressing the challenges/barriers (if you have any)?]

1. Tutorial Center

a. Staffing:

As mentioned above, the Tutorial Center’s greatest need for support is in securing full-time permanent staffing. This would involve a full time director, full time faculty for teaching tutor training classes and working with the students in Tutr 200, and a full-time permanent classified instructional assistant. We are simply at our limit of service with two part-time employees. This is the first and most important area to be addressed in supporting the Tutorial Center.

b. Facilities, Materials, and Technology

- The greatest support right now would be to have *Tutor Trac* approved & installed in the Tutorial Center to accommodate growth. Tutor Trac is a powerful tutorial scheduling and record keeping program which would provide a more effective method of registration and scheduling.
- A smart classroom within the present Tutorial Center is needed for leading classes & workshops.
- Updated textbooks are needed for tutors and students to use as reference.
- Financial support is needed for new tutoring programs to reach more LPC students.
- A plan for larger, yet similarly designed facility, since we are at or near capacity many days.
- The Tutoring Workgroup came to the consensus that all programs would benefit from being under a centralized learning center. This umbrella would need sufficient space in which to operate, a full time permanent faculty director, a full-time permanent classified Instructional Assistant, funding to maintain the level of growth, and technology to keep pace.

c. Basic Skills

- The Tutorial Center has always served the needs of basic skills students from its inception.
- Because a good percentage of our tutoring is done in basic skills math, ESL, and English classes, innovative and effective methods of learning assistance need to be funded and implemented to assist them more .
- We need more institutional funding in order to hire more tutors to accommodate the services we have started such as: tutors in the math x classes, LPCTutorLink (linking one tutor per class), TAGS (Tutor Assisted Group Study).
- We our staff and funding limitations we can only offer minimal ESL tutoring (scheduled and drop-in only) but would like to offer conversation groups, workshops to assist ESL.

d. General

- We would like to be open later to serve our evening students if we had the staff and budget.
- We need to be able to train more tutors each semester by running more than one class of Tutr 17A and 17B.
- We would like to provide on-line 24-7 tutoring service (from a company such as Net Tutor) to serve DE students and those needing assistance on weekends and when we are closed.

- With more funding and staffing we have the potential to begin SI (supplemental instruction) or a modified supplemental instruction program. We would also like to offer specialized tutoring and topical workshops.
- e. Greater staffing in the tutorial center and a greater collaboration between all tutorial services on campus. There was an ad hoc group working on that last year but it disbanded and hasn't been revived yet.

2. RAW Center

- a. The RAW Center needs an ongoing and institutionalized coordinator who receives 2 CAH/semester. While this was supposed to be in place already, the position seems to be re-evaluated every year by a new administrator.
- b. The present budget that pays for tutors is \$12,500/semester. The coordinator had to get grants from the ASLPC, LPC Foundation, and CTE to allow the RAW Center to stay open for more than 12 weeks and more than 6 hours/day. These grants have also allowed us to have email tutoring coverage. The RAW Center really needs \$2,000 more per semester to be institutionalized.
- c. Training Instructor tutors has been on an ad hoc basis, depending on the budget. While training material exists in our online Blackboard shell, the face-to-face discussions around best practices and trouble shooting, as well as modeling, are invaluable. We need institutionalized and mandatory tutor training for our faculty, with F hour pay for the adjunct, at least at the beginning of each year.
- d. For writing tutors, an established ongoing training course would be useful, two hours in the beginning of the semester, and monthly supervisory meetings for two hours, in which the instructor could problem solve, model paper feedback, and provide mini-lessons for the tutors.
- e. It would be helpful for the next RAW Coordinator to know if they will get the additional tutor funding of \$2k more per semester. The ASLPC is not telling us about grants until the fall, so the center will likely be underfunded and have to return to a shortened schedule with fewer hours per day.

H. RECOMMENDED WORDING of the PLANNING PRIORITY:

[Prompt: As the Dean, Tutorial Center Coordinator, or RAW Center Coordinator, can you please recommended wording of planning priority?]

None.

Adoption of Planning Priority

This Planning Priority was adopted by the President, Dr. Barry Russell, in May 2015 with no changes.