

Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART)
Friday, November 4, 2011, 10:00 a.m.
Board Room

Attendees: present in yellow

Administrative Council Management Council	Instructional Council (Non-Administrative)	Other Members	
Alfredo Cuellar Betty Kakiuchi Bill Gay Brian McNeece# Carlos Fletes Dawn Chun Efrain Silva Gloria Carmona Gordon Bailey Jeff Cantwell Lisa Seals Rick Webster	Sergio Lopez Taylor Ruhl Ted Ceasar Tim Nakamura Tina Aguirre Todd Evangelist Todd Finnell * Travis Gregory* Victor Jaime* John Lau* Janis Magno* Kathy Berry* *Executive Council # CART Co-Chair	Becky Green Bruce Seivertson Carol Hegarty Cathy Zazueta Daniel Gilison David Drury David Zielinski Edward Wells Jose Lopez Jose Ruiz Krista Byrd Kseniya Gregory Michael Heumann Rick Castrapel Rick Goldsberry Terry Norris Toni Pfister Valerie Rodgers	Trini Arguelles, Lead Counselor# Alex Cozzani, Teaching Faculty Eric Lehtonen, Academic Senate President Jessica Waddell, College Council President Oscar Hernandez, Teaching Faculty Jim Fisher, Teaching Faculty Bradford Wright, Teaching Faculty Grace Espinoza, Classified Carol Lee, Non-Teaching Faculty Norma Nunez, Non-Teaching Faculty Mary Carter, Confidential Alberto Izarraraz, ASG Representative Paige Lovitt, Non-Teaching Faculty Patricia Robles, Classified Toni Gamboa, Classified Jeff Beckley, Teaching Faculty Kevin Marty, Teaching Faculty Emily Bill, Adjunct Non-Teaching Faculty Angie Ruiz, Teaching Faculty

Recorder: Linda Amidon

Call to Order

Co-chair Brian McNeece called the regular meeting of the Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART) to order at 10:00 a.m.

Changes to Agenda

Agenda Item C, Review your questions from the Guide to Evaluating Institutions: August 2010, was moved up as the second item on the agenda; item B, Student and Employee Surveys, is now the third item on the agenda.

A. Review of Last Meeting Notes (in Dropbox) – Linda Amidon

- M/S/C Seivertson/Castrapel to approve minutes of the October 21, 2011 meeting as presented.

B. Review Standard Questions from *Guide to Evaluating Institutions: July 2010* – Brian McNeece

(NOTE: The latest version of the Guide and Addendum to Standard III.B, both dated July 2011, were placed in the dropbox and sent to CART members prior to the meeting.)

- Co-Chair McNeece explained that teams should write the standards to answer the questions in the guide. He demonstrated how to respond to the questions using the Standard III.B draft as an example. He noted that the narrative should target the questions in the guide. When reviewing the questions teams should focus on those standards which the college did not meet or partially met.
- Co-chair Trini Arguelles recommended the guide and process described by Co-chair McNeece as a good tool for evaluating each standard.

- Daniel Gilson cautioned that while the questions are major guidelines they are not all inclusive and may not be sufficient to address the unique processes or other issues identified by the college.
- Val Rodgers cautioned that the Commission will hold the college to its planning agendas. She advised standard team members to be reasonable when describing what the college will do in the future to address areas of concern. VP Berry stated that the plans should include items that can be accomplished within six years.
- VP Berry advised standard teams that if they find that the college does not meet a particular standard, this should be stated in the self-evaluation. Otherwise, the Commission will be much harder in its evaluation of the college.
- In response to question and concern, editing Team members explained the endnotes process and described the format for referencing evidence documentation.
- The committee agreed with VP Berry's recommendation that the college website include a separate web page for program review.

C. Student and Employee Surveys

- Co-chair McNeece reported that to date there are 989 responses to the student survey and 168 responses to the employee survey.
- The student survey results are positive so far and reflect a vote of confidence for the college.
- Rick Castrapel noted that the demographics of the students show a good cross-section of students that participated in the survey.
- Dawn Chun recommended that after the student survey is completed, the district should notify students that it will respond to the top three student concerns identified by the survey.
- The survey responses include 400 comments. Co-chairs McNeece and Argüelles and Bruce Seivertson volunteered to compile a summary of the comments.

D. Reports on Individual Standard first draft status and needs --Team Leads

E. Draft deadline for November 18

1. **Standard I.A – Alex Cozzani:** The team is awaiting additional information and needs to work on endnotes.
2. **Standard I.B – Efrain Silva:** The team will meet next Tuesday to review member comments.
3. **Standard II.A – Brian McNeece:** Krista Byrd was added to the team. Members are reviewing each others' work. He discovered they were off track before he reviewed the questions in the *Guide to Evaluating Institutions*.
4. **Standard II.B – Ted Ceasar:** The team is working on the evidence.
5. **Standard II.C - Taylor Ruhl :** The team is editing a second draft and will work on evidence.
6. **Standard III.A - Travis Gregory (absent):** Jessica Waddell stated that the team will go back and review the questions in the *Guide* and reformat the draft accordingly.
7. **Standard III.B - John Lau:** The draft will be reformatted as a result of Co-chair McNeece's review of the questions in the *Guide*.
8. **Standard III.C - Todd Finnell (absent):** No report.
9. **Standard III.D – John Lau:** The draft will be reformatted as a result of Co-chair McNeece's review of the questions in the *Guide*. He will also expand the draft to address the *Addendum to Standard III.B. – Guide to Evaluating Institutions*, which focuses on financial stability.
10. **Standard IV.A – Kathy Berry:** The draft is complete but she included endnotes incorrectly. She will answer the questions in the *Guide*. The team will meet the November 18 draft deadline.
11. **Standard IV.B – Jan Magno:** A Trustee has been assigned to the team. Since it will be necessary to schedule meetings with the Trustee, it's likely the team won't meet the draft deadline. The team will respond to the section of the standard related to the selection of the college president as the current search process progresses. A draft of the standard will be ready in January.

F. Other

- VP Berry shared important highlights of the Fall 2011 ACCJC News, particularly the revisions to Standard III.B.
- VP Berry reported that one of the colleges whose accreditation was recently reaffirmed (San Diego City or San Diego Mesa) included SLOs and PLOs on its program web pages, which was viewed favorably by the Commission. She recommended and the committee agreed to post SLOs and PLOs on Division and Department websites, including career opportunities for all majors, on the program web pages and to develop a standard template for use by all programs. The timeline for this project: Create a program template by December 1; post SLOs and PLOs by August 1, 2012. Co-Chair McNeece updated the self-evaluation timeline checklist currently in the dropbox to include these items.
- Discussion was held regarding whose responsibility it is to update the Accreditation web page. Michael Heumann reported that he had discussed this issue with CTO Todd Finnell, who indicated there wouldn't be anyone to update the web page until the webmaster position vacated by Omar Ramos is replaced in January.
- Co-chair McNeece announced that he had applied to become an evaluator to serve on an accrediting team.
- Dawn Chun reminded committee members to notify her of additional data needs.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:51 a.m.
- **Next meeting: November 18, 2011**