

**Modesto Junior College
Planning & Budget Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 16, 2011**

Present:

Karen Walters Dunlap, Vice President of Instruction (**Acting** MJC President Co-Chair)
Mike Adams, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President (non-voting)
Jenni Abbott, Director of Grants & Resource Development
Kevin Alavezos, Academic Senate appointee
Iris Carroll, Learning Resources Liaison, Academic Senate appointee
Paul Cripe, Academic Senate appointee
Lori Dangerfield, CSEA appointee
Carmen Fernandez, Vice President of College Administrative Services
Kenneth Hart, Director of Research and Planning (ex-officio)
Martha Robles, Student Services Administrator
David Ward, YFA appointee

Absent:

Co-Chair, MJC President (non-voting)
Jane Chawinga, YCCD Internal Auditor and Budget Analyst (ex-officio)
Jim Clarke, Technology/Distance Education Liaison (Academic Senate appointee)
Rosanne Faughn, CSEA appointee
Rose LaMont, YFA Budget Analyst
Don Low, Vice President of Student Services
Maurice McKinnon, Instructional Dean
Dale Pollard, Faculty Career Technical Education Liaison (Academic Senate appointee)
Robin Jones, ASMJC Student Rep

Check In – What are you Hearing? (not recorded)

Business

1. Review of Minutes

Action Item

The minutes of April 22, 2011 were tabled for approval at the next meeting.

2. Pow Wow

Karen Walters Dunlap informed members: The June 23rd Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Pow Wow has been cancelled. Plans will, however, move forward for the August 18th Planning & Budget Committee workshop.

The college will be going back to the vice president model with a separate vice president for Student Services and College Administrative Services and not the combined position (VP of College & Student Support) previously announced.

With the resignation of Dr. Loewenstein, there will most likely be an interim president for six months beginning August 1 and ending in January or February when a permanent president is selected.

The May revise will probably be unveiled by noon today and should give the college a better budget picture.

There will not be a “do over” for everything that was recently cut. There will be some adjustments to some of the reductions, however.

3. Next Steps

Karen Walters Dunlap reminded members that last year the planning councils were introduced for the first time and she felt that PBC needs to move forward with the councils. The method needs to be refined, incorporating the recommendations the Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee gave PBC.

Finalization of equipment, technology, and facility requests for allocation of resources for the assessment action model needs to be done. PBC needs to continue that process and finalize what and how it is going to do facilities resources. Kitchell is there to facilitate writing resources for what PBC is going to do.

The Facilities Master Plan, Educational Master Plan & Program Review are not integrated. Karen would like this group to also do the planning on facilities that would integrate the use of facilities at the college. She pointed out that there are a lot of vacated spaces. The facilities committee could be used as a resource and is not a shared governance body. The different councils would make the facilities and equipment recommendations.

Karen Walters Dunlap informed members that PRNet software will be implemented in the fall. The integrated plan needs to be refined. PBC needs to review the District Strategic Plan changes, taking a look at MJC’s Strategic Plan. Karen pointed out that the Facilities Master Plan is updated, as necessary, by the Board.

Mike Adams referenced Resolution SP11-D: Planning & Budget to Assess Viability of Programs where PBC examines every program using the following A-E criteria. As stated in the resolution, the Academic Senate directs the Planning & Budget Committee to facilitate and oversee the

Assessment of Program Viability for all programs meeting any of the criteria for programs with questionable viability.

Procedure for Identification of Programs with Questionable Viability

A program's viability may be considered to be "at-risk" for the following reasons:

- A. A sustained (three or more years) period of low enrollment
- B. Insufficient frequency of section offerings, resulting in students' inability to complete the program in a timely fashion.
- C. Ongoing low retention or persistence rates.
- D. For programs that are mainly academic in nature: low program completion rates or lack of availability of the transfer major.
- E. For programs that are mainly vocational in nature: lack of demand in the workforce.

To honor the spirit of this resolution, Mike suggested identifying 4 to 6 programs to run through this summer. Karen responded that faculty needs to be present before programs can be identified. Jenni Abbott suggested doing a random selection each year of programs to examine.

Paul Cripe interjected that this is an attempt to prevent the same thing from happening with another president that happened with the recent cuts.

Karen Walters Dunlap suggested that the deans could use the A-E criteria for their executive summary. Then, you would have deans identifying programs who know the programs that are viable. Karen added that the deans know the programs that are struggling and they work directly with the faculty.

The Planning & Budget Committee will review and address the Program Viability document at the June 23rd regular meeting from 1-3 (lunch served).

Possible agenda items:

- 1. Integrated Planning
- 2. Program Viability process
- 3. Rubric for SLOs
- 4. Program Review template
- 5. Technology Council

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT