

Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART) Friday, November 15, 2013, 10:00 a.m. Board Room

| Administrative Council | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | □Victor Jaime – Pres. | ☑Kathy Berry - VP | ☑Todd Finnell - VP | □John Lau - VP |
| | ☐Travis Gregory - Dean | ☑Tina Aguirre - Dean | ☑ Brian McNeece -Dean | □Efrain Silva - Dean |
| | ☑Ted Ceasar - Dean | ☑Sergio Lopez - Dean | □Jeff Cantwell – Dir. | ☑Susan Carreon - Dir. |
| | □Jose Carrillo – Dir. | □Jeff Enz – Dir. | □Carlos Fletes – Dir. | □Becky Green - Dir. |
| | □Betty Kakiuchi – Dir. | □Omar Ramos – Dir. | □Lisa Seals – Dir. | □Rick Webster -Dir. |
| | □Bill Gay – PR Consult. | | | |
| Instructional Council | ☑Craig Blek | ☐ Rick Castrapel | □Dave Drury | ☑ Daniel Gilison |
| (Dept. Chairs and Coord.) | □Rick Goldsberry | ☐Becky Green | ☑ Carol Hegarty | □Allyn Leon |
| | □Jose Lopez | □Jill Nelipovich | ☑Terry Norris | □ James Patterson |
| | ☐Sydney Rice | □Jose Ruiz | ☑Ed Scheuerell | □Ed Wells |
| | ☑Kevin White | □Cathy Zazueta | | |
| Other | ☐Trini Arguelles (NT) | ☐Michael Heumann (T) | □Alex Cozzani (T) | ☐Eric Lehtonen (T) |
| | ☐Jessica Waddell (CC) | □Oscar Hernandez (T) | □Emily Bill (NT) | □ Patricia Robles (C) |
| | □Norma Nunez (NT) | ☑Mary Carter (CC) | ☐Audrey Morris (T) | □Toni Gamboa (C) |
| | □Jeff Beckley (T) | ☐Kevin Marty (T) | ☐ASG Representative | ☑Martha Garcia (NT) |
| | | | | |
| Visitors: | | | | |
| Recorder: | Linda Amidon | | | |

- A. Call to Order Brian McNeece and Tina Aguirre
 - ➤ Dean McNeece called the regular meeting of the Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART) to order at 10:05 a.m.
- B. Review and Approval of Minutes of November 1, 2013 Meeting
 - ➤ M/S/C S. Lopez/Berry to approve the minutes of the November 1, 2013 meeting as presented
- C. Update on Previous Discussion Items
 - 1. Status of 2014 Warning Follow-Up Report Tina Aguirre
 - a. Rec. 1 Team Todd Finnell
 - Dean Ted Ceasar reported that a first draft has been submitted
 - Dean Brian McNeece noted that processes and activities related to information literacy currently exist at the college, however, efforts must be expanded
 - i. Master Planning Calendar Draft Martha Garcia
 - Major changes in the planning process are suggested for 2015
 - Assessment of institutional effectiveness will be conducted every two years
 - Discussion has been held regarding the committee that will be charged with approving enhanced funding, but a final determination has not been made
 - A list of planning committees is being developed; Executive Council will review the list and forward to EMPC
 - The planning calendar will be presented as a work-in-progress to College Council and Academic Senate next week
 - Discussion:
 - Recommend that the process for approval of enhanced funding requests be formalized and announcement made at the next campus forum
 - The committee self-evaluation form can be used to measure institutional effectiveness but more is needed, such as a survey
 - Recommend that planned committees referenced in the planning calendar be established now

- Response to Recommendation 1 implies that all committees must be included in the planning calendar
- Recommend that planning committees have set meeting schedules
- Recommend that plans have a two or three year assessment cycle but end on a six-year cycle
- Data triggers when the program review cycle can begin; under the original program review timeline data is to be provided in October
- Inquiry made regarding whether key parts of the planning calendar can be automatically added to faculty and staff calendars (a division calendar for deadlines could be considered)
- ii. Status of Evidence
 - Evidence has been identified in the response narrative and is available
- b. Rec. 7 Team Travis Gregory (Absent); SLO Coordinator Sydney Rice (Absent)
 - VP Berry reported that major revisions are recommended and the draft response was returned to writers
 - i. Status of Evidence
- c. Rec. 8 Team John Lau (Absent) No Report
 - i. Status of Evidence
- Discussion regarding all responses to recommendations in general:
 - There are too many "we-are –going-to-do" statements throughout the responses
 - The Commission is interested in what we've done; if we don't carry out our plans this will give the Commission the impression that the college doesn't take the recommendations seriously since the college has had sufficient time to address identified deficiencies
 - Some responses give the impression that the college never realized problems existed
 - Replace "as-we-discussed" statements with statements that summarize previous discussions
 - Accomplishments must be adequately captured in the follow-up report
 - Include tables in the follow-up report to provide a visual for evaluation team members
 - Statements included in the response to Recommendation 1 regarding the committee charged with approving enhanced funding requests must align with statements in the response to Recommendation 8
 - There is a lot of work to be done before the follow-up visit
- d. Critical Dates:

November 18 College Council Reviews Report

November 20 Senate Reviews Report

February 19 Board certifies the Follow-Up Report

- The follow-up report is not ready for presentation to participatory governance committees
- Recommend that College Council and Academic Senate hold special meetings to approve the follow-up report
- 2. Status 2012 Self-Evaluation Report Actionable Improvement Plans Brian McNeece
 - A review was conducted of the status of action plans and applicable updates made
 - ➤ It was noted that the Commission may ask about the progress on action plans during the followup visit
- D. New Discussion
 - 1. Report from START Committee Martha Garcia
 - > START continues to work on FCMAT recommendations
 - An action plan will be established for all recommendations
 - Priority and focus is on actions plans related to human resources and budget
 - Executive Council has also been addressing FCMAT recommendations
 - 2. Program Review Template Efrain Silva
 - > The Academic Program Review form was revised and includes input from Instructional Council
 - > The revised form merges elements of the old form with recommendations made by the Commission and FCMAT
 - > The revisions made to the form facilitates the transition to the program review process in SPOL and will serve as a worksheet when SPOL is implemented

3. Other

- > SPOL Consultant Erin Bell has not responded to inquiry regarding the best way to handle evidence in SPOL, therefore, the process for storing evidence for the follow-up report is currently in limbo
- > Recommendation made to follow the same process used previously and then store the evidence in SPOL at a later time

ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 a.m.
- Next Meeting: December 6, 2013, 10:00 a.m., Board Room