Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the
Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART)
Friday, February 26, 2016, 10:00 a.m., Board Room

Voting Members	☑Nick Akinkuoye - CIO	☑ Tina Aguirre - Dean	☐Sergio Lopez - Dean	☑Ted Ceasar - Dean
	☐Efrain Silva - Dean	☐Ash Naimpally - Dean	☐David Zielinski - Dean	☐SEMPC Chair *
	☐Academic Senate Rep	☐ College Council Rep	☐Maggie Vizcarra (RC Rep)	☐Adriana Sano (CC)
	☐Classified Mgr. Rep	☑Allyn Leon (Chair)	☐Dave Drury (Chair)	☐ Chair
	☐Kevin White (Chair)	☐Jose Lopez (Chair)	☐Alex Cozzani (Fac. Rep)	☐Oscar Hernandez (Fac. Rep)
	☐ASG Rep			***SEMPC Co-Chaired by two Deans (Ted and Efrain)**
Consultants	☐Victor Jaime – CEO	☐John Lau - CBO	☐Sergio Lopez-Interim CSSO	☐Jeff Enz – Interim CTO
	☑Jose Carrillo – Dir.	☐Omar Ramos– Dir.	☐Lisa Seals– Dir.	☐Carlos Fletes – Dir.
	☐Gaylla Finnell-DE Coord.	☐Jill Nelipovich-SLO Coord.	☐Jill Nelipovich-BS Coord.	
Visitors:				
Recorder:	Linda Amidon			

A. Call to Order
- ➢ The regular meeting of the Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART) was called to order by CART Co-Chair Tina Aguirre at 10:06 a.m.
- ➢ The committee welcomed Allyn Leon as the new CART Co-Chair.

B. Review and Approval of Minutes of December 4, 2015, Meeting
- ➢ The minutes of the December 4, 2015, meeting were accepted as presented.
- ➢ Director of Institutional Research Jose Carrillo stated that he understood he was a consultant to CART, not a member; additional consultants were identified; the committee membership was revised to reflect the membership in the CART Bylaws.
- ➢ Concerns regarding meeting attendance was discussed; recommendation was made to consider an alternate meeting day as Friday morning meetings have not been well attended.

C. Update on Previous Discussion Items
1. Report from SEMPC
a) 2015-2016 Program Review and Planning Cycle
- ➢ SEMPC Co-chair Ted Ceasar reported that enhanced budget requests are in the enhanced budget report template, have been reviewed by the deans and directors, and will be sent to the resource committees for prioritization.

b) 2014-2015 Institutional Effectiveness Progress Report
- ➢ Ted Ceasar stated there was no report at this time.

2. ACCJC Midterm Report
a) Status of Final Report and Evidence
- ➢ Dr. Akinkuoye noted the Midterm Report has been submitted to Academic Senate for a first reading and discussed at College Council. The Board will take action on March 5, 2016. It was assumed there would be a follow up visit; however, Dr. Nick confirmed with ACCJC there would be no campus visit. This is a deviation from the past practice related to the Midterm Report, but at that time the college had been on warning status. We are on target to deliver the report on time on March 15, 2016. Linda Amidon added that the Midterm Report has been more challenging than previous reports in terms of evidence.

b) Brief Review of Content PowerPoint
- ➢ The committee reviewed the Midterm Report PowerPoint that will be presented at the Board Retreat on March 5.

- General discussion took place regarding the recommendations and action plans addressed in the Midterm Report. Dr. Akinkuoye identified the area of SLOs/PLOs as critical to the improvement of assessment outcomes and tying all activities to program review processes. He is working on an Assessment Handbook. Linda Amidon added that resources for professional development continues to be a challenge.
- Brief reference was made to previous discussions by the Strategic Educational Master Planning Committee regarding the frequency of program review.
- The new Accreditation Standards will impact existing program review and planning processes.

3. **Report on SPOL**
    a) **Status of Full Cycle of Assessment and Reports**
    - Jose Carrillo stated there was a teleconference with SPOL staff which has led to discussions regarding changes in SLOs and how they are uploaded. Discussions have also been held regarding formalizing a process whereby the sections are added each semester. There is a disconnect with the job roles related to SPOL, specifically for the SLO Coordinator, Curriculum Specialist, Department Chairs, and Institutional Researcher.
    - Tina Aguirre expressed concern that the SLO Coordinator should not be expected to be the SPOL system analyst. A dedicated SPOL expert or internal contact is needed for that role, just as there are for Banner, Argos, and DegreeWorks. It was also noted that it had been determined early on that it would be impossible for the SLO Coordinator to facilitate all SLO activities for faculty and address related concerns and issues. To address this, it was also proposed early on that department chairs would play a larger role in that regard, at the department level, but this hasn't occurred.
    - It was further noted that IVC's program review process initially did not align with SPOL, and adjustments had to be made to the process to fit SPOL; it was suggested that adjustments to IVC's existing SLO assessment process may be needed.
    b) **Status on Upload of 2014 Accreditation Standards and SEMP Goals**
    - Jose Carrillo received clarification on the 2015-2021 SEMP goals, and he will complete the uploads in SPOL before the end of summer for use in the 2016-2017 program review cycle, which begins fall 2016.
    - Ted added that the SEMPC will determine if all programs will conduct a comprehensive review in fall 2016 and another in three years. In addition, the SEMPC will determine if the annual process could be more limited, i.e. only assessment and budget/resource needs. Jose noted that such a pattern may require two different program review templates within SPOL. Further review of the details involved in implementing a three-year cycle is needed.
    c) **Status of Dept./Program Completion of Goals/Objectives**
    - Jose Carrillo will provide a report at the next meeting that outlines the status of 2014-2015 objectives (i.e., started, planned, completed).
    - Jose expressed concern that too many program objectives are based on budget enhancements; he finds that program assessment of objectives too often indicate that objectives were either not started, not met, or not completed because budget enhancement tied to the objectives were not approved. He recommends that programs include objectives with budget enhancements and some without them. A three-year program review cycle should address this concern.

4. **Report on Planning Calendar**
    a) **Status of Updating Process Timelines**
        ➢ Ted Ceasar and Efrain Silva will be meeting soon to formalize a plan for updates from committee chairs and to ensure the recent discussion on aligning Program Review, Curriculum, Scheduling, and Budget planning is implemented in the online calendar. Linda Amidon recommended another review meeting to make sure all processes and timelines are addressed.
D. **New Discussion**
    1. **6-Year Accreditation Cycle**
        ➢ Our next report is due in 2018-2019 (March 2019), which means data and evidence must be gathered systemically beginning in 2016-2017. A comprehensive program review cycle in 2016-2017 aligns with the accreditation cycle.
        a) Self-Evaluation Process
            ➢ Item deferred until April 2016 meeting.
        b) Timeline Development
            ➢ Item deferred until April 2016 meeting.
E. **Adjournment**
    ➢ The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.
F. **Next Meeting**
    ➢ To be announced