

Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART)
Friday, February 17, 2012, 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 Omar Ramos 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	Angie Ruiz Becky Green Bruce Seivertson Carol Hegarty Cathy Zazueta Daniel Gilson David Drury David Zielinski Edward Wells Jose Lopez Jose Ruiz Krista Byrd Kseniya Gregory Michael Heumann Rick Castrapel Rick Goldsberry Terry Norris Toni Pfister	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 Alberto Izarraraz

Recorder: Linda Amidon

Call to Order

Co-chair Brian McNeece called the regular meeting of the Continuous Accreditation Readiness Team (CART) to order at 10:03 a.m.

Agenda Items/Discussion

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

- M/S/C Seivertson/Castrapel to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2012, meeting as presented.

B. Report from CART Members from Accreditation Conference, Anaheim Feb 10-11 –Kathy, Brian, Trini, Michael

- CART Co-chairs Brian McNeece and Trini Arguelles, CIO/ALO Kathy Berry, and 2013 Self Evaluation Co-Editor Michael Human provided a report on the conference:
 - only 7 of 36 schools evaluated were reaffirmed accreditation, all others were sanctioned including two that were placed on “show cause” (Cuesta College and College of the Redwoods), which is the final step before closure
 - the primary issues that colleges are being sanctioned for include 1) governance issues (e.g., micromanaging by Board), and 2) financial stability (Palo Verde was recently notified that the institution has until April 1, 2012 to show a plan of financial stability or the college will be forced to close)
 - the Commission does not consider the State of California’s budget or union contracts factors in its evaluation of a college
 - the U.S. Department of Education and Senate does not look favorably upon the governance structure of California Community Colleges as it impedes student success

- the Commission is being pressured by the federal government to look at California community colleges closely
 - the Commission doesn't look favorably upon athletics
 - emphasis is placed on totally integrating accreditation standards in campus operations on an ongoing basis; integrating standards in master plan; tying purpose of committees to the accreditation standards; using language from the standards in committee mission statements
 - a lot of colleges are anxious about their accreditation status
 - emphasis on collaboration, it is a time to come together for a common purpose
 - emphasis on quality of program review, need to simplify
 - surveys are good tools to utilize for program review
 - integrate SLOs into quality of instruction
 - when writing the self evaluation, be reasonable and specific on planning agendas, don't include too many as the Commission will hold the college to its planning agendas (recommendation: one or two per standard); if no planning agenda, state that there is no need for any new planning efforts; planning agendas must be completed before the next self evaluation
 - the Commission may take action against a college, regardless of whether or not the action is recommended by the visiting evaluation team
 - financial information requested by the commission is very specific, thus data reliability becomes incredibly important
 - the Commission will be looking at a college's credit hour policy, which must be included in the catalog
- It was recommended that a statement regarding the latest accreditation news should be disseminated to the entire college
- C. Regular Discussion: Endnotes, Guide Questions, Links, Evidence – All**
- Co-chair McNeece provided a demonstration on how to insert an endnote into the self-evaluation document
 - Discussion held regarding issues with committee web pages (membership updates needed), and need for migration of SLO data from old website
- D. Report from Editor on Status of Current Draft – Michael**
- Editor Michael Heumann
 - announced that Carol Hegarty, Humanities Department Chair, volunteered to serve as co-editor
 - requested that standard authors focus on writing, don't let web issues hold them back
- E. Update on Previous Discussion Items**
- 1. Share Point – Todd Finnell**
 - VP Finnell couldn't attend the meeting but Co-chair McNeece reported that VP Finnell had sent an email to CART members with a link to an overview of SharePoint, which when implemented will provide a more stable platform for file-sharing and communications across campus.
 - 2. Training for updating new websites with relevant committee and division/department minutes and other materials – Brian and Trini**
 - Co-chair McNeece:
 - stated that Grace Espinoza and Sara Hernandez from the Arts and Letters Division, and Silvia Murray and Elvia Camillo from the Behavioral and Social Sciences Division, had recently received training provided by Omar Ramos and Larry Valenzuela; he also encouraged appropriate staff to obtain training
- F. Update from Team Leads- When did you last meet and when will you again meet?**
- 1. Standard I.A – Alex Cozzani:** In the process of finding evidence, will meet next week.

2. **Standard I.B - Efrain Silva:** Met last fall, will meet next week; close to a final draft, working on evidence.
3. **Standard II.A – Brian McNeece:** Will have two meetings next week.
4. **Standard II.B – Trini Arguelles (Ted Ceasar absent):** Collecting evidence.
5. **Standard II.C - Taylor Ruhl:** Final draft in Dropbox.
6. **Standard III.A - Travis Gregory (Absent).** No report
7. **Standard III.B - John Lau (Absent).** No report
8. **Standard III.C - Todd Finnell (Absent).** No report
9. **Standard III.D – John Lau (Absent).** No report
10. **Standard IV.A – Kathy Berry:** Will meet with Alfredo Cuellar next week; section done but need to insert endnotes.
11. **Standard IV.B – Jan Magno:** The Board needs to review district policies and procedures to ensure the college is in compliance. The section related to the president will be completed after a permanent president is in place.

G. Review of Timeline to Prepare for Team Visit March 2013

- The committee reviewed and revised the timeline and the updated timeline was placed in Dropbox; key dates include the following:
 - March 1, 2012 – final draft of standards completed and sent to Michael Heumann
 - May 4, 2012 – final draft of self evaluation sent to shared governance groups
 - March 11 – 13, 2012 – accreditation visit

H. Sacred Pledge to Complete Work ASAP

- Co-Chair McNeece encouraged standard teams to complete their sections of the self evaluation

I. Other

- VP Berry provided a brief background of the substantive change process and reported on the proposals that IVC faculty is currently working on:
 - accreditation standards require that institutions notify the Commission when certain changes are made, e.g., new majors and certificates, offering 50% or more of a program via distance education
 - substantive change proposals for new programs must be approved by the Commission before an institution offers courses under the program
 - IVC, along with many other California Community Colleges, is out of compliance with the substantive change requirements; the Commission is allowing colleges the opportunity to work on compliance
 - no new programs shall be established and implemented while an institution is on warning status
 - substantive change proposals must be submitted and approved by the Commission six months prior to a team visit
 - faculty is responsible for curriculum; therefore, faculty have a key role in substantive change proposals
 - faculty and administrators are currently working on 14 substantive changes proposals related to distance education and new majors and certificates implemented since the 2007 self-study
 - the processing fee for each proposal is \$500

J. Next Meeting March 9, 2012 10:00 a.m. Board Room

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 11:04 a.m.