



Modesto Junior College
Accreditation/ Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 2, 2009

Present:

Dr. Karen Walters Dunlap, Co-Chair, Vice President of Instruction
Dr. Ken Hart, Director of Research and Planning
Dr. Bob Nadell, Vice President of Student Services (Student Services Administrator)
Wendy Griffiths-Bender, Yosemite Faculty Association Appointee
Curtis Martin, Faculty Program Review Liaison
Brian Sanders, Dean of Science, Mathematics, and Engineering
Jenny Netto, Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair
Heather Townsend, Recorder
Adrienne Peek, Faculty Curriculum Committee Co-Chair, President Elect, Academic Senate
Mark Anglin, Dean of Agriculture, Environmental Sciences, and Technical Education
Letitia Miller, California Schools Employees Association Appointee
Gary Whitfield, Vice President of College and Administrative Services

Absent:

Michael Adams, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President
Sarah Mesenhimer-Johnson, California Schools Employee Association Appointee
Dale Phillips, Faculty Career and technical Education Liaison

1. Check in

2. Program Review Updated

- a. C. Martin and B. Sanders opened discussion about PRNET and the implementation progress of PRNET. PRNET is moving along great. Curtis and Brian stated that it should be up and running by January 2010 or sooner.
- b. KWD announced that program review addendums are due October 16. At this time divisions are meeting to produce their addendums by the deadline date. H. Townsend noted that many addendums have been turned in to the Instruction Office.

- c. KWD opened discussion on budget reduction analysis. KWD asked, “How will the AIE committee link program review with the budget reduction analysis?” The committee discussed many possible ways to link the two together. Some suggestions were:
- Program review should include a 5% or 10% budget reduction planning scenario.
 - To analyze what savings can be made and incorporate savings review into the program review templates.
 - To identify what needs are through the program review process and then work on making changes to satisfy current needs.
 - It was added that program review the way we prioritize important needs. After examining incoming program reviews, the college will have a better understanding of priorities and can make savings or adjustments from there.
 - To take a closer look at the process for program discontinuance by evaluating completer data, It was added that completer data does not always reflect students who complete coursework but do not apply for awards.
 - It was suggested that we look at what we are doing currently first. Keep things the way they are when it comes to retrieving information for program review. We should not change the addendums but go forward and analyze our strategic plan, mission goals, and objectives.

3. Accreditation Self-Study

- a. KWD passed out a proposed self-study timeline to the committee members. The timeline shows the accreditation process from start to finish. The committee members motioned to change some items in the timeline. The committee feels that we should move up some of the dates in order to be ahead in the accreditation process.
- b. KWD announced the need to form a steering committee for accreditation and mentioned that some institutions use the AIE committee as the Accreditation steering committee.

VOTE: The committee voted unanimously to have AIE act as the MJC Accreditation Steering Committee.

KWD also announced her plans to add an additional Accreditation chairperson or “tri-chair”, representative of CSEA, with the goal of increasing CSEA involvement in the accreditation process. She is currently in the process of developing a job

description for this role with R. Faughn, CSEA President.

- c. Dr. K. Hart presented a quick report from the accreditation training workshop he attended. K. Hart explained the accreditation process as shown in the workshop. In the accreditation process there must be a dialogue for everything. He stated that there are four standards and each section has three elements. The elements are as follows:

1. Description
2. Evaluation
3. Planning

4. Review of Strategic Plan

- a. Item was removed from discussion. Item has already been approached and discussed. KWD and B. Nadell will meet with H. Townsend to review meeting minutes on who, what, when, and how's of the strategic plan discussions.

5. Assessment Committee

- a. A. Peek is to head the assessment committee which is currently in the development stage. Adrienne explained that the assessment "workgroup" committee is a subcommittee of AIE. The committee will develop, manage, review, and assess the SLO's, PLO's, and ILO's. Some committee members have already been identified.

6. Membership of the AIE Committee

- a. B. Nadell opened discussion regarding the immediate need for an additional AIE committee member from his division. The AIE committee discussed the title that would appropriately fit this new committee member.

VOTE: The committee voted unanimously to add an additional member to AIE from B. Nadell's office. The new member will have the title of Student Services Administrator. A. Peek noted the committee's nomination and will forward the request for an additional AIE Student Services Administrator to the Academic Senate.

- 7. Check out