Modesto Junior College Mission Statement

MJC is committed to transforming lives through programs and services informed by the latest scholarship of teaching and learning. We provide a dynamic, innovative educational environment for the ever-changing populations and workforce needs of our regional community. We facilitate lifelong learning through the development of intellect, creativity, character, and abilities that shape students into thoughtful, culturally aware, engaged citizens.

Education is the reason our institution exists. To this end, we value innovation, professionalism, integrity, and responsible stewardship. We foster respect for and interest in the diverse individuals and histories of our community. These values are foundational to the way we shape our programs and services, make and communicate decisions, reinforce collaborative relationships within our community, and promote civic engagement.
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Certification of the Follow-Up Report

Date: October 15, 2012

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Modesto Junior College
435 College Avenue
Modesto, CA 95350-5808

This 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report is in response to recommendations cited in the February 1, 2012 action letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

We certify that there was broad participation in the production of the 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report by the college community, that the report accurately reflects actions taken by the college and the district to address the recommendations, and that the report was presented to the Board of Trustees for review prior to submission.
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Chair, Board of Trustees  
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Dr. Joan Smith  
Chancellor  
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Professor of Anthropology  
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President  
Modesto Junior College Academic Senate

Jillian Daly  
President  
Yosemite Faculty Association

Rosanne Faughn  
President  
California School Employees Association

Kevin Sabo  
President  
Associated Students of Modesto Junior College
Statement on Report Preparation

The October 15, 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report for Modesto Junior College has been under development since receipt of the ACCJC letter dated February 1, 2012. Interim president, Dr. Mary Retterer, shared the letter that moved MJC to Probation status with the college and public via the MJC website. She initiated the college wide effort to fully address the recommendations in a presentation on February 13, 2012. Dr. Retterer communicated directly with the Academic Senate regarding the need for two key faculty positions to resolve the attainment of the level of proficiency in Student Learning Outcomes according to the ACCJC Rubric, and to prepare the Follow-Up Report. Two outstanding faculty members were identified by the Academic Senate, Dr. Debi Bolter, Accreditation Co-Chair, and Dr. James Todd, SLO Assessment Coordinator, to work collaboratively with administration in leading the college toward fully meeting the Standards and responding to the recommendations from the Commission.

Interim president Dr. Retterer established a point persons workgroup that identified individuals responsible for each recommendation. These individuals led the process required to meet the recommendation and to craft a draft response. The point persons workgroup met regularly through July 2012.

MJC established a planning agenda item for Standard IV.A.3 which was reinforced by college recommendations five and six. In November 2011, the college began the process of evaluating, revising, and ratifying an updated version of the Introduction to Decision Making at Modesto Junior College Fall 2008-2010. A workgroup, with representatives from each constituency, met over the course of seven months in the creation of a document that codified past practice, and set the stage for moving the college forward with a revised participatory governance structure. The proposed document brought forward a major commitment to a new participatory decision making process, supported by a modified college governance structure. Further, the workgroup developed a set of guiding principles that defined and established an environment of good faith effort, free from fear of retaliation. This document served as the foundation for the new participatory governance structure proposed by incoming president Jill Stearns.

Modesto Junior College has undergone significant organizational change since the submission of the Special Report dated March 15, 2012. On July 2, 2012, Jill Stearns joined MJC as president and on September 4, 2012, Susan Kincade started her role as the vice president of instruction. There are no interim executive administrators at MJC or Yosemite Community College District at this time.

President Stearns and Dr. Bolter made regular progress reports to the College Council, Academic Senate, Board of Trustees, and college community on matters related to achieving the goals of the ACCJC’s recommendations and writing the Follow-Up Report. The president’s weekly written communication includes a section on accreditation to keep the
broader community informed of college progress. Dr. Bolter and Susan Kincade invited the campus to three oral reading sessions where responses to recommendations were finalized. The sessions were attended by faculty, staff, administrators, and student leaders.

Michelle Pilati, president of Academic Senate and Scott Lay, president Community College League of California jointly led a college wide professional development event April 4, 2012. The presentation provided training for faculty, staff, and administrators on participatory governance and effective participation. This event specifically addressed some of the challenges reflected in college recommendations five and six. Further clarification of the ACCJC Standards and expectations of accreditation were provided in a Technical Visit from ACCJC on August 29, 2012. College leaders joined the District Council for this presentation with a question and answer session led by Dr. Christa Johns and Dr. John Nixon.

Another event demonstrating the broad faculty involvement in the work leading to the writing of this report was the Outcomes Assessment Day held on August 24, 2012. The mandatory flex event spanned a full day. Dr. Todd, SLO Assessment Coordinator, and the Assessment Workgroup developed and implemented the day’s activities culminating in college wide discussion of program level outcomes and institution level outcomes. The tremendous amount of planning, preparation, and untold hours of organization of data resulted in an event that enabled participants to engage in rich dialogue around assessment outcomes and development of action plans based on the evaluation.

The workgroups established for each college recommendation established the action plan for addressing the recommendation, carried out the plan, and contributed to the draft of the recommendation response. The draft responses were compiled into a single voice by Dr. Bolter and the evidence was organized by Heather Townsend. Vice President of Instruction, Susan Kincade, collaborated closely with Dr. Bolter in the finalization of the document and oral reading process to ensure accuracy and clarity of the report.

The MJC Follow-Up Report describes the wide-ranging activities the college community engaged in to fully meet the recommendations of the Commission and includes evidence in support of the efforts delineated in the document. The report also includes plans for next steps that will assist MJC in continuing the process of improving institutional effectiveness in support of student learning.

Respectfully,

Jill Stearns
President, Modesto Junior College
Response to Yosemite Community College District Recommendation #1

District Recommendation #1: In order to fully meet the standard and improve the effectiveness of its human resources, the team recommends the systematic evaluation of all personnel at stated intervals with appropriate documentation. (Standards III.A, III.A.1.a.)

YCCD Human Resources maintains all employee evaluation data and information to assist the colleges in effectively identifying which employees are in need of evaluation as outlined in each constituent group’s contract or handbook. Appropriate information will be sent to Modesto Junior College, Columbia College, and Central Services and will include employee name, position title, evaluation code, immediate supervisor name, last evaluation date and next scheduled evaluation date.

The District Human Resources office will maintain evaluation tracking and generate reports to monitor the oversight and effective implementation of all employee evaluations. In addition, the colleges will maintain their own evaluation tracking spreadsheets and processes to ensure that once notified by Human Resources of evaluations due dates, that evaluations are conducted, and the results are forwarded to Human Resources.

Classified Process

The evaluation process for classified staff requires that permanent employees be evaluated every two years and probationary employees shall be formally evaluated two times during the one-year probationary period. The first evaluation shall occur during the first three (3) months and the second during the following six (6) months of employment.

As part of the evaluation process and per the contract, Human Resources will send out quarterly report notifications to each supervising manager beginning July 1 of each fiscal year. These reports provide the supervisor with a complete evaluation status of classified staff in their department. The report provides the employee’s evaluation cycle, last evaluation date and next scheduled evaluation date. It serves as a tracking record for supervisors showing which evaluations are due and which have been completed and received by Human Resources. Evaluations must be completed within 30 days of the due date and forwarded to Human Resources for recording and filing.
Human Resources will monitor progress and document completed evaluations. If evaluations are not received within one month of the due date, the college president or appropriate vice chancellor will be notified.

**Leadership Team Process**

The process for leadership team members requires that employees be evaluated every year. As part of its evaluation process and per the Leadership Team Handbook, Human Resources will send out quarterly report notifications to each supervising manager beginning July 1 of each fiscal year.

These reports provide the supervisor with a complete status of their department or college. The report provides the employee’s evaluation cycle, last evaluation date and next scheduled evaluation date. It serves as a tracking record for supervisors showing which evaluations are due and which have been completed and received by Human Resources.

Human Resources will monitor progress and document completed evaluations. The college president or appropriate vice chancellor will be notified quarterly of all overdue evaluations beginning July 1 of each fiscal year.

**Faculty Process**

The evaluation process for faculty requires that tenured/regular faculty will be evaluated once every three academic years during the spring semester. Contract/probationary faculty will be evaluated in the fall semester each academic year until tenure is awarded.

As part of the evaluation process and per the contract, Human Resources send out notifications and due dates for fall and spring evaluations to the college presidents on August 1 and January 1. The reports will provide to the managing supervisor the employee’s evaluation cycle, last evaluation date, and next scheduled due date.

Human Resources will monitor progress and document completed evaluations. The college president will be notified prior to the start of each term, on August 1 and January 1, of all overdue evaluations.

YCCD Human Resources will update all employee evaluation data and information files to document the completion of the evaluation process for each employee.
Evaluation

During this past year, the Human Resources evaluation tracking process was updated to include full time faculty evaluations. The Human Resources office worked in conjunction with the District vice chancellors, college presidents, and vice presidents to fully implement the system. All parties have a clear understanding of the process and scheduled timelines.

Planning Agenda

Both college presidents will continue to work with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Information Technology to ensure the evaluation tracking process supports the District and both colleges’ efforts to complete evaluations in a timely manner. The District Human Resources will provide the necessary oversight to ensure that current evaluations are maintained in the employee’s personnel files.
Evidence for District Recommendation 1

1. Contract, CSEA
   http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/Contract%20CSEA.pdf

2. Contract, YFA
   http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/YFA%20Agrmt%202007-2008%20Reopener%20with%2018a.pdf

3. Leadership Team Handbook (currently being updated)
   http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/LT%20HANDBOOK%202009%20-%20FINAL.pdf

4. Classified Evaluation Memo
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/student_learning/Accreditation_Resources/accreditation_2012_followup/default.aspx

5. Manager Evaluation Update
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/student_learning/Accreditation_Resources/accreditation_2012_followup/default.aspx

6. Faculty Evaluation Notice to College Presidents
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/student_learning/Accreditation_Resources/accreditation_2012_followup/default.aspx
Response to Yosemite Community College District Recommendation #2

District Recommendation #2: In order to fully meet the standard, the teams recommend that the District and the colleges review institutional missions and their array of course offerings and programs in light of their current budgets. (Standards III.D, III.D.1; ER17.)

Yosemite Community College District Mission

The YCCD Mission reads: “The Yosemite Community College District is committed to responding to the needs of our diverse community through excellence in teaching, learning and support programs contributing to cultural and economic development and wellness.”

This Mission Statement was reviewed and updated as part of the Strategic Planning Process that began in November of 2010 and resulted in the YCCD Strategic Plan being finalized and approved by District Council in April 27, 2011. The Strategic Plan provides the framework and support for all other College and Central Services Plans. The YCCD Mission and Vision Statements are the foundation for the YCCD Strategic Plan. The Board of Trustees approved the YCCD Strategic Plan-2007-2015 on May 11, 2011.

District Council is a District Wide committee that is comprised of all District constituency leadership at both colleges within the District and Central Services. MJC participants agreed to align their college’s mission statement with that of the District Mission Statement, as they are in the process of updating their planning processes. Columbia College agreed, after review, that their mission statement was in alignment with that of the District.

This was affirmed at the April 25, 2012, District Council meeting.

The college’s processes are delineated below:

Relationship between the District and Columbia College Mission

On April 6, 2012, Columbia College’s Council reviewed the college’s mission with respect to Yosemite Community College Recommendation 2. Columbia College President Gervin reported that Chancellor Smith had asked both colleges in the District (Columbia College and Modesto Junior College) to review their mission statements in relation to alignment with the YCCD Mission Statement. Discussions were held and the Columbia College Council members offered the following observations and feedback:
The Columbia College Mission Statement and YCCD Mission Statement are aligned in the following ways:

- Serving the needs of students
- Diverse communities
- Teaching and learning in support of programs through focus on high quality.

The Columbia College Mission Statement and YCCD Mission Statement are not aligned, according to the Council by being generic in terms of measurable student learning outcomes. However, the Council conceded that this may very well be intentional as “measurable student learning outcomes” take place at the college level, not at the District. Overall, the Columbia College Council agreed that the Columbia College Mission Statement and the YCCD Mission Statement are in “harmony” and not at cross purposes with each other. Further, the Council was comfortable with the fact that the District’s Mission Statement is broader, which allows specifics to be operationalized at the college level. Again, as noted above, that was the intent of the District Council in the development of the District Mission Statement—it was designed to be “overarching” to allow and support the specifics to be developed at the college level. The purpose of the YCCD District Office is to provide support to the colleges’ operations, not control them.

Columbia College revised its Mission Statement on February 3, 2012, and it was Board approved on, March 14, 2012.

**Relationship between the District and Modesto Junior College Mission (MJC)**

MJC engaged in a review and revision of the College Mission Statement. Interim President Retterer initiated the review to ensure that the MJC mission statement and values accurately reflected the current educational purpose, the intended student population, and the commitment to student learning in alignment with the Yosemite Community College District mission statement. It was noted in the MJC College Council minutes that the YCCD mission statement was “firm”, as it was revisited and approved by District Council in the spring of 2011 and it is specific enough to state the District’s mission, yet general enough to allow the colleges the flexibility to develop their own “focused mission” statements. It was affirmed by MJC’s College Council on April 2, 2012, to adopt the following statement: “The College Council of Modesto Junior College affirms that its mission statement will be reviewed and aligned with the mission statement of the Yosemite Community College District and with College’s course offerings for the immediate future in light of current California Community College budgets.” Two workshops were held to gather input and analyze data in support of mission statement revision. A small workgroup convened to draft a new college mission statement. This statement was adopted by MJC’s College Council on October 1, 2012. The MJC mission statement was approved by the YCCD Board of Trustees on October 10, 2012.
College Course and Program Planning

Both colleges have designated committees/groups that are continuously meeting to review their budgets. With the constant fluctuation of the State Budget, the colleges have directed their focus (as has the State) on offering courses for transfer, Career Technical Education (CTE) and basic skills. This does not mean that other courses are not offered—but, this has been the focus of the colleges in course planning. The colleges of the YCCD are no different than colleges in any district throughout the state. They have had to make constant decisions and choices of cuts to services in all program and services areas.

Columbia College has formed a group called the “Big Picture Budget Discussion Group” (BPBDG) that reports to the College Council. This group was formed in the spirit of transparency and is led by the college president. The foundation of the group is “TLC”-(the “T” in transparency, “L” in listen and “C” in communication). This group meets to discuss everything from cuts in VTEA funding to college fiscal shortfalls and programmatic impacts. This group meets in addition to the Columbia College Council. MJC has a working committee called the Planning and Budget Committee, renamed the Resource Allocation Committee in September 2012. In light of the current fiscal challenges in the state, the MJC Resource Allocation Committee, in addition to having meetings on the college’s budget, have broadened their discussions. The newly adopted college governance council structure changes this group from a committee to a college governance council. The Resource Allocation Council is responsible for developing a budgetary master plan which will guide resource allocation recommendations in periods of growth and reduction. The Resource Allocation Council is responsible for making a college budget recommendation to College Council each spring as part of the annual budget development process.

Evaluation

During this past year, significant progress has been made by both colleges in addressing their programmatic needs while at the same time dealing with some of the most horrific budget challenges the State of California has known. In addition, the colleges have worked diligently on addressing their accreditation report findings for the fall 2012 re-visititation.

Planning Agenda

Both colleges will continue to work with their designated committees and/or groups to assess course offerings with respect to the state budget. It does not appear at this time that the California State Budget will stabilize anytime in the near future. The pending November Tax Initiatives’ passage (or not) will determine additional reviews of course offerings at the colleges.
Evidence for District Recommendation 2

1. YCCD Strategic Plan 2007-2015  

2. Minutes of District Council Meeting, April 27, 2011  

3. Minutes of the Board of Trustee Meeting, May 11, 2011  
   http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/05.11%20MAY%20MINUTES.pdf

4. Minutes of District Council Meeting, April 25, 2012  

5. Minutes of the Columbia College Council Meeting, February 3, 2012  
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/documents/college_council/minutes/2-3-12.pdf

6. Minutes of the Board of Trustee Meeting, March 14, 2012  
   http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/03.12%20MARCH%20MINUTES.pdf

7. Minutes of the MJC College Council, April 2, 2012  
   http://www.mjc.edu/general/president/docs-collegecouncil/ccc4-2s122.pdf

8. Announcement of the MJC Strategic Planning Workshop, August 23, 2012  

9. Minutes of the Board of Trustee Meeting, September 12, 2012  
   http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/archives.htm

10. Big Picture Budget Discussion Group  
    http://www.gocolumbia.edu/documents/budget/default.aspx
Response to Yosemite Community College District Recommendation #3

District Recommendation #3: The team recommends the District and Board of Trustees develop policies on the delegation of authority to the college president. (Standard IV. A.2.a, IV.B.3.e.)

Board Policy 7430, states that “the Chancellor may delegate any powers and duties entrusted to him or her by the Board, including the administration of Colleges and centers.” The Chancellor, however, will be specifically responsible to the Board for the execution of such delegated powers and duties. Although, it is clearly stated in the current Board Policy that the delegation of authority comes from the Board to the Chancellor and that the Chancellor may delegate powers and duties, the District has added more-specific language to the Policy with regard to the college presidents.

The additional language to Policy 7430 adopted by the YCCD Board in September 12, 2012 now reads:

“The Chancellor supervises, evaluates and delegates authority to the college presidents. The college presidents serve as the chief executive officer for their respective college.”

In the Chancellor’s job description it clearly states the supervision and evaluation of the presidents under duties and responsibilities. Further, both the Columbia College President and Modesto Junior College President job descriptions define the role and responsibility of the presidents as: “The President serves as the educational leader and the Chief Executive Officer of the college.” Further, these same job descriptions, under the heading of Supervision Received and Exercised, it is stated that the presidents, “Report to the Chancellor of the District.”

Again, although it was clearly stated in the Procedure 7430 that “the Chancellor may delegate any powers and duties entrusted to him or her by the Board (including the administration of Colleges and centers), but will be specifically responsible to the Board for the execution of such delegated powers and duties”, we have added more-specific language to the Procedure with regard to the college presidents.

The additional language to Administrative Procedure 7430 now reads:

“The delegation authority comes from the Board to the Chancellor to the college presidents.”

Although the Yosemite Community College District’s Board Policy 7430 is in alignment with Education Code Sections 70902(d), 72400 and Accreditation Standard IVB.3.e, which was adopted on August 6, 2002, and revised on September 2, 2003; the additions to Policy and
Procedure identified above were reviewed in District Council on July 18, 2012, and adopted by the Board of Trustees on September 12, 2012. The title also changed to “Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor and College Presidents.”

**Evaluation**

The Yosemite Community College District’s Procedures and Job Descriptions were updated to clearly state delegation of authority from Board of Trustees to the college presidents via the Chancellor. As long as the Chancellor is responsible to the Board of Trustees for the evaluation of the college presidents, this delineation of authority is correct and proper.

**Planning Agenda**

No planning agendas are necessary.
Evidence for District Recommendation 3


2. Minutes of the Board of Trustee Meeting, September 12, 2012
   http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/09.12%20SEPTEMBER%20MINUTES.pdf

3. Job Description, Chancellor
   http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/classificationreview/mgmt_job_desc/Chancellor%20YCCD.pdf

4. Job Description, MJC President
   http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/classificationreview/mgmt_job_desc/President%20MJC.pdf

5. Job Description, Columbia College President
   http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/classificationreview/mgmt_job_desc/President%20CC.pdf

6. YCCD Administrative Procedure 7430
   http://www.yosemite.edu/trustees/policyandprocedures/7430%20Delegation%20of%20Authority%20to%20Chancellor%20and%20Presidents.pdf
Response to Yosemite Community College District Recommendation #4

District Recommendation #4: The team recommends the District develop policies that clearly define, and follow, the process for hiring and evaluating the college president. (Columbia College 2011 Evaluation Report References Standards IV.B.1; IV.B.1.j and Modesto Junior College 2011 Evaluation Report References Standards III.A, III.A.1, III.A.3; ER3, ER5.)

Board Policy 7431 was adopted on February 8, 2012. It clearly states the following:

“In the case of a Chancellor vacancy, the Board shall establish a search process to fill the vacancy and shall select the Chancellor.

In the case of a college president vacancy, the Chancellor shall work with the Board to establish a search process to fill the vacancy and to select college president(s).

The search process(es) shall be fair, open, and transparent and shall comply with relevant regulations.”

When the Accreditation Team last visited, this Policy was in the final review process by the YCCD Policy and Procedures Committee and therefore was not yet officially recognized. Since its adoption by the Board on February 8, 2012, the Accreditation Team Recommendation 3 has been satisfied.

In Board Policy 7405, Board Responsibility, it is stated, “In conference with the Chancellor, it is primarily the Board’s business to consider and act upon the following: ...

10. Establish a search process to fill the vacancy of college president(s) (See policy 7431).”

The presidents are evaluated on an annual basis. The only exception would be that of a new president, in which an evaluation is conducted at the first six months of service, and then again at the one year anniversary. The process and timeline for the presidential evaluation is as follows:

- April 1 - Presidential evaluation surveys sent to college community.
- April 10 - Survey closes.
- April 30 - Survey results to Chancellor and college president.
• May 15 - Self-Evaluation, survey results and draft goals for upcoming year due to the Chancellor.

• May 16-31 - One-on-one meetings to be scheduled with Chancellor to discuss evaluation.

• May Board Meeting - Notify Board that the results of the evaluations are being processed and report forthcoming at June meeting.

• June Board Meeting - Closed Session Item: Chancellor to share evaluation results with Board of Trustees. Satisfactory evaluations will result in a roll of the president(s) contract, effective July 1.

Finally, it is clearly stated in the Chancellor’s job description that part of their responsibility is the supervision and evaluation of the college presidents.

**Evaluation**

The Yosemite Community College District has developed Policies and has Procedures in place that clearly define and follow the process for hiring and evaluating the college presidents. The Board of Trustees, working with the Chancellor recently hired a new president for MJC and she began her duties on July 1, 2012. Further, the Columbia College President, hired on July 1, 2011, has been evaluated both at six-month and one-year intervals, according to the process and timeline described above.

**Planning Agenda**

No planning agendas are necessary.
Evidence for District Recommendation 4

1. Minutes of the Board of Trustee Meeting, February 8, 2012
   http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/02.12%20FEBRUARY%20MINUTES.pdf

2. YCCD Board Policy 7405
   http://www.yosemite.edu/trustees/policyandprocedures/7405%20Board%20Responsibilities.pdf

3. YCCD Board Policy 7431

4. Presidential Evaluation Timeline
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/student_learning/Accreditation_Resources/accreditation_2012_followup/default.aspx
**College Recommendation #1**

In order to fully meet the standards for mission and effectiveness, the team recommends the college analyze community demographic and student enrollment data to more descriptively define the intended student population and emphasize their commitment to student learning in the mission statement. The team further recommends that course and program planning be explicitly linked to the defined population so the college is able to clearly assess its success in institutional planning, decision making, and meeting student needs as related to its mission. (Standards I.A, I.A.1, I.A.4; II.B.3; ER2)

---

**Responsible Workgroup Introduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenni Abbott* (Administrator)</th>
<th>Pat Fontes (Community)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Anelli (Faculty)</td>
<td>Steve Grubb (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Alavezos (Faculty)</td>
<td>Michael Guerra (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Anglin (Administrator)</td>
<td>Jennifer Hamilton (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Bailey (Faculty)</td>
<td>Carolyn Hart (Leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Baggett (Faculty)</td>
<td>Greg Hausmann (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Banuelos (Administrator)</td>
<td>Antoinette Herrera (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bassitt (Community)</td>
<td>Cece Hudelson-Putman (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Beebe (Faculty)</td>
<td>Lisa Husman (Leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Bethel (Leadership)</td>
<td>William Kaiser (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Bettencourt (Administrator)</td>
<td>Peggy Kroll (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Boodrookas (Administrator)</td>
<td>Rose LaMont (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debi Bolter (Faculty)</td>
<td>Michelle Marquez (Leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cripe (Faculty)</td>
<td>Curtis Martin (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Daly (Faculty)</td>
<td>Maurice McKinnon (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian De Angelis (Faculty)</td>
<td>Pedro Mendez (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena Dorn (Administrator)</td>
<td>Letitia Miller (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Droual (Faculty)</td>
<td>Cheryl Mulder (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dow (Faculty)</td>
<td>Linda Nowak (Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Dyrssen (Student)</td>
<td>Debbi Partridge (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Ennis (Faculty)</td>
<td>Sherri Potts (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fay (Administrator)</td>
<td>Chad Redwing (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary Retterer (Administrator)  Brenda Thames (Administrator)  James Todd (Faculty)
Mike Riley (Trustee)  James Todd (Faculty)  Heather Townsend (Short-term Contract)
Martha Robles (Administrator)  Marla Uliana (Classified)  Marla Uliana (Classified)
Abe Rojas (Trustee)  Joan Van Kuren ( Classified)  James Varble (Student)
Jeff Rowe (Community)  Tim Vaughan (Faculty)  David Ward (Faculty)
Kevin Sabo (Student)  Teryl Ward (Faculty)  John Williams (Administrator)
Brian Sanders (Administrator)  Rob Stevenson (Faculty)  John Williams (Administrator)
John Scheuber (Community)  Tanya Smith (Classified)  Gerald Wray (Faculty)
Mike Sharif (Student)  Jill Stearns (Administrator)  Sandy Woodside (Faculty)
Brian Sinclair (Faculty)  Rob Stevenson (Faculty)  John Zamora (Faculty)
Tanya Smith (Classified)  Mike Sundquist (Administrator)  * Point Person(s)

Modesto Junior College engaged in a comprehensive review of the College mission that resulted in a revised mission statement which articulates the commitment to student learning, defines the intended student population, and clearly identifies the College’s educational purpose. The new MJC mission statement was approved by College Council on October 1, 2012 and the Yosemite Community College District Board of Trustees on October 10, 2012 [1.1, 1.2]. It aligns with the Yosemite Community College District mission statement as well as that of Columbia College [1.3].

**MJC’s Mission Statement**

* MJC is committed to transforming lives through programs and services informed by the latest scholarship of teaching and learning. We provide a dynamic, innovative educational environment for the ever-changing populations and workforce needs of our regional community. We facilitate lifelong learning through the development of intellect, creativity, character, and abilities that shape students into thoughtful, culturally aware, engaged citizens.

*Education is the reason our institution exists. To this end, we value innovation, professionalism, integrity, and responsible stewardship. We foster respect for and interest in the diverse individuals and histories of our community. These values are foundational to the way we shape our programs and services, make and communicate decisions, reinforce collaborative relationships within our community, and promote civic engagement.*
Process of Review and Revision of the MJC Mission Statement

College stakeholders spent five months identifying, gathering, and analyzing data related to our student population, industry, and community demographics [1.4, 1.5, 1.6]. In addition, effective mission statements in the other California community colleges and in industry were reviewed [1.7]. Careful analysis of collected data informed stakeholders in the development of a college mission statement that effectively captures MJC’s purpose, intended student population, and its commitment to student learning.

In April 2012, 116 campus stakeholders responded to a survey to identify MJC’s critical values [1.8]. The data provided a starting point for the May and August strategic planning workshops. In the day long planning session on May 19, 2012, 49 stakeholders reviewed survey data and demographics to identify gaps affecting student success and to develop preliminary college goals [1.9, 1.10]. In the August follow up workshop, 58 stakeholders including members of the community and board of trustees, developed three critical elements of the mission: 1) identification of the intended student population, 2) articulation of MJC’s commitment to student learning, and 3) definition of its educational purpose [1.11, 1.12]. Specific words and phrases to be used in writing a mission statement were recommended.

The analysis of the data resulted in a common understanding of the current student population at MJC. The vast majority of MJC students, including online students, live in the service area of the college. They are first generation students from multiple and diverse ethnic backgrounds who need strong support services to increase success, retention, and persistence [1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17]. Discussions centered on challenges facing MJC students and how to more closely align program planning with identified industry needs.

As a result of the planning sessions, MJC clarified its mission and rewrote the mission statement. The new mission statement will be integrated into the program review, planning, and resource allocation processes (also referenced in responses two and five).

Future Actions

- Maintain a high profile of the mission statement in publications, on the College website, and governance handbook (fall 2012 and ongoing);

- Continue regular cycle of program review which underscores the support of courses and development of programs emphasizing the College’s intended student population and their needs (Instruction Council, Student Services Council, ongoing);
• Continue to allocate resources to improve student learning as identified in program review which requires links between the College mission statement and funding decisions (Resource Allocation Council, College Council, ongoing);

• Assess the effectiveness of course and program planning, decision making, and resource allocation related to the College mission by each governance group on an annual basis (College Council, Accreditation Council, Facilities Council, Instruction Council, Resource Allocation Council, spring 2013 and ongoing);

• Review the mission statement on an annual basis (College Council, spring 2013 and ongoing).
College Recommendation #1

Evidence cited

1.1 College Council Minutes October 1, 2012
1.2 YCCD Board Agenda Oct. 10, 2012
1.3 MJC Mission Alignment with YCCD Mission
1.4 Stanislaus County Industries and Occupations
1.5 Spring 2011 Awards
1.6 DE Student Demographics – Raw Data
1.7 Mission Statement Examples – August Workshop (PowerPoint)
1.8 Values of Modesto Junior College Employees, Survey Results, April/May 2012
1.9 Sign in sheet, 5.15.2012
1.10 MJC Institutional Effectiveness Workshop Minutes, 5.15.2012
1.11 Sign in sheet, 8.23.2012
1.12 August Workshop Summary 8.23.2012
1.13 MJC Student & Community Demographic Highlights
1.14 MJC Student Demographics
1.15 Environmental Overview Stanislaus and MJC
1.16 H.S. Attendance and Graduation Rates by Ethnicity
1.17 DE Student Demographic Analysis
College Recommendation #2

The team recommends the college attain the level of proficiency according to the ACCJC Rubric for Student Learning Outcomes by 2012. The college must ensure that faculty members differentiate between course learning outcomes and course objectives. It must also establish clear standards for assessing course learning outcomes that will inform course-level curricular and pedagogical improvement. In addition, the college must complete its development of outcomes at the program and institutional levels. The college must demonstrate that it assesses the outcomes and uses them in college decision making processes to improve institutional effectiveness. The college must create venues to maintain an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Student Services must develop and implement student learning outcomes, establish systems of assessment to make improvements in the delivery of its programs and services, and communicate to students these learning outcomes. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6; II.A.2.i, II.B.4; ER10).

Responsible Workgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Administrator</th>
<th>Faculty/Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Aristotelous</td>
<td>Letitia Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Baggett</td>
<td>Kamran Payvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Bailey</td>
<td>Chad Redwing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Christensen</td>
<td>Brian Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena Dorn</td>
<td>John Sola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Ennis</td>
<td>James Todd*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Herrera</td>
<td>Heather Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cece Hudelson-Putnam</td>
<td>Teryl Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Hunt</td>
<td>Gerald Wray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Mendez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Point Person(s)

Structured activities since the commission visit in October 2011, and work that may not have been readily evident at the visit, have built an infrastructure to streamline outcomes assessment at MJC, and provide the College with a framework for sustainable quality improvement. The results of these efforts are summarized in bullet form below. Further elaboration and evidence are presented chronologically that demonstrate MJC’s attainment of the proficiency rubric criteria for student learning outcomes.
• Student learning outcomes are established for all courses, programs, degrees, support services, administrative units, and the institution.

• Student learning outcomes and results are housed within the computer system established for curriculum and program review.

• Student learning outcomes are accessible online for ease of student access.

• Assessment results drive the process that informs decision making to improve the institution.

• Administrative support is provided to faculty to further improve student learning outcomes.

• Program learning outcomes for degrees and certificates align with the course learning outcomes for the program’s required coursework.

• Institutional venues on campus have been created to provide opportunities for ongoing, self-reflective, college wide education and dialogue on assessments.

**Student learning outcomes are established for all courses, programs, degrees, support services, administrative units, and the institution.**

During spring 2012, faculty from areas lacking program learning outcomes were contacted and asked to write them. In March and April the Curriculum Committee approved these outcomes, evidenced for 96 percent of degrees, certificates, and skills recognitions [2.1, 2.2]. These program level learning outcomes were then published in a 2012-2013 catalog addendum [2.3]. The remaining four percent have been approved by the curriculum committee and will be included in the 2013-2014 catalog [2.4].

From fall 2011 through summer of 2012 all units in the student services reviewed and revised student learning outcomes to facilitate more useful data collection and analysis of quality [2.5]. All student services learning outcomes have been or will be assessed in fall 2012.

**Student learning outcomes and results are housed within the computer system established for curriculum and program review.**

In early fall 2012, the Curriculum Committee passed resolution F12-CC1 to incorporate course learning outcomes into the review cycle of curriculum, including their alignment with course objectives [2.6]. This system facilitates the catalyst between outcomes and curricular improvements.
Additionally, learning outcomes for course, program, and general education learning outcomes, along with service area and administrative area outcomes, are centrally placed within an established computer system with college wide access (CurricUNET).

**Student learning outcomes are accessible online for ease of student access.**

In August 2012, a new assessment website was authored [2.7]. The website serves as an easy portal link to all assessment data and outcomes in CurricUNET. The website houses links to the annual Comprehensive Assessment Reports, which provide summaries of accomplishments in outcomes assessment for each year. Also posted on the assessment website are the College’s general education and institutional learning outcomes.

In early fall 2012, all course learning outcomes were entered into MJC’s class scheduling software (Pirates Net). This addition provides these course level outcomes at the point of registration for students, along with the course description, to help inform them about what skill sets will be developed in each course, and overarching goals of the course [2.8].

During fall 2012 student service areas posted their student learning outcomes and service area outcomes on their departmental website and further communicate the learning outcomes to students at the point of service such as workshops, presentations, and related activities [2.9].

**Assessment results drive the process that informs decision making to improve the institution.**

Assessment results affect curricular and program changes. One example from Business Administration 310, Bookkeeping 1, illustrates this relationship. In spring 2009 faculty assessed the following course learning outcome: Determine and apply generally accepted accounting principles relating to bookkeeping. The results revealed a 57 percent success rate. An analysis revealed that as a result of faculty retirements, all bookkeeping sections are currently taught by adjunct faculty. In response to the low success rates, full-time faculty in the department organized a meeting with all adjunct instructors to analyze the assessment results and to create a collaborative improvement plan. In the meeting, faculty shared common struggles with teaching bookkeeping as well as best practices in how to ensure student learning. Through faculty collaboration, strategies were identified to increase both student performance and success. The meeting concluded with the following recommendations: 1) Faculty would consistently assign more comprehensive problems to assist students in grasping the accounting cycle in its entirety; 2) It was agreed that the comprehensive practice set would be assigned earlier in the term to determine if completion rates would increase; 3) Faculty agreed to build more formative assessment opportunities of the accounting cycle into their courses in order to provide timely feedback of student
mastery; 4) Faculty agreed to create opportunities for further collaboration. The accounting cycle was re-assessed in fall 2011; success rates improved from 57 percent to 82 percent. Faculty are currently collaborating to develop a customized practice set to reinforce the accounting cycle with plans to pilot it in spring 2013. Additional examples of assessment results affecting curricular and program changes are included in the evidence section [2.10, 2.11].

Assessment results drive funding through program review. An example from ART 108, 109 and 110 (ceramics classes) illustrates how resource requests integrate outcomes assessments. For these ceramic courses, one course learning outcome includes the student’s ability to use a pottery wheel. In the 2011 program review, faculty requested funding based on data that this outcome was difficult to master due to insufficient pottery wheel availability. Three electric pottery wheels were requested to replace three broken wheels, increasing the number of work stations, and providing access to students who have physical difficulties operating the traditional kick wheels. The request was funded at $4,260. More examples of assessment results linked to funding are included in the evidence section [2.12, 2.13].

Assessment results supply meaningful measures of the College’s values, and these in turn drive resource allocation. In HUMAN 101 (humanities class) one of the course learning outcomes is that “students will be able to explain the roles that philosophical, imaginative, and religious thinking and traditions play in shaping human culture and social institutions.” After assessing this, faculty identified students having difficulty mastering this outcome because they lacked cultural literacy to engage the materials at a college level, and lacked an interest to do supplemental background research. Humanities faculty members set out to create entertaining and educational multi-media resources to help students succeed. One of these efforts was the creation of a humanities video library. A grant was awarded through the Modesto Junior College Foundation to create this library. The resources funded high-quality documentaries and educational media on mythology, ancient civilizations, eastern and western cultures and civilizations, the scientific revolution, architecture, cinema, philosophy, drama, literature, poetry, music, the influence of mathematics in the humanities, art history, religious studies, history, and architecture. The materials are available for instructors to use as additional classroom materials to increase student learning about the humanities.

Administrative support is provided to faculty to further improve student learning outcomes.

The faculty assessment coordinator job description was redefined in May 2012 to narrow its scope while maintaining the same release time. This change was intended to make the position more manageable and to encourage faculty leadership and participation [2.14, 2.15]. The position was filled in June 2012 [2.16].
The president also appointed administrative leadership to an Assessment Executive Committee in summer 2012. Two deans were added to help facilitate the planning and implementation of an Assessment Day in fall 2012 [2.17]. Additional classified staff support was shifted to student learning outcome efforts over the summer to assist in data entry of course learning outcomes into CurricUNET and Pirates Net, and to coordinate these data for Assessment Day activities.

**Program learning outcomes for given degrees and certificates align with the course learning outcomes for the program’s required coursework.**

MJC held an Assessment Day in the beginning of fall 2012. Objectives of this day were to provide comprehensive training, discussion, enactment, completion, and critical engagement with student learning outcomes for faculty, staff, and administrators [2.18]. The structured activities of the day provided all participants with training to differentiate course objectives from outcomes, and with the tools to complete the process of multi-tiered outcomes assessment. The final product of these activities culminated in 160 programs that established program learning outcomes for given degrees and certificates that align with the course learning outcomes for the program’s required coursework [2.19].

**Institutional venues on campus provide opportunities for ongoing, self-reflective, college wide education and dialogue on assessments.**

In January 2012, Marilee Bresciani spoke at the College’s Institute Day, invited by the Academic Senate leadership team and funded through the office of instruction [2.20]. She trained faculty on program learning outcomes mapping. Following her presentation, all divisions spent the afternoon collectively reviewing and mapping program learning outcomes within their areas. During this week there were additional professional development activities that focused on outcomes assessment, for example, a training session for the student services faculty and classified staff [2.21].

In August 2012, the Assessment Day provided a dedicated day long forum for institutional self reflective dialogue on the implications of assessment results. Many of the presentations from that day were uploaded to the MJC assessment website, including: video training modules on mapping outcomes for institutional effectiveness; the storage and maintenance of learning outcomes in CurricUNET; assessments and its role in program improvement; and examples of curricular changes in response to learning outcomes [2.22].
Further Action

Ongoing and systematic actions to sustain quality student learning outcomes at Modesto Junior College include the following recommendations of the Outcomes Assessment Workgroup [2.23]:

- Assessment forums to provide ongoing, institutional level dialogue that can be maintained for sustained improvements in student learning, college-level planning, budget processes, and educational refinement (Professional Development Coordinating Committee, Outcomes Assessment Workgroup, ongoing).

- Assessment website that will house institutional materials related to student learning outcomes (office of instruction, ongoing).

- Learning outcomes assessment and program review be operationalized into the established curriculum review cycle (Outcome Assessment Workgroup, Curriculum Committee, Instruction Council, spring 2013)

- Standards for outcomes assessment be revisited and redefined as needed (Outcome Assessment Workgroup, Instruction Council, ongoing).
College Recommendation #2
Evidence cited

2.1  Curriculum Committee minutes, 3.27.2012
2.2  Curriculum Committee minutes, 4.12.2012
2.3  2012-2013 Catalog Addendum
2.4  Curriculum Committee minutes, first meeting in September 2012
2.5  Student Services Outcomes, summer 2012
2.6  Curriculum Committee Resolution: F12-CC1
2.7  Outcomes Assessment Website
2.8  Screen shot from PiratesNet of a course description with course learning outcomes
2.9  Example from Student Services website
2.10 Assessment Data to Improve Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness
2.11 Compiled examples of outcomes assessments that affected change in instruction, curriculum and/or programs: BUSAD 310, PSYCH 118, HE111, IIS13, N257, SME AUO
2.12 2010-2011 program reviews for Art, English and Speech Communication
2.13 Resource Allocation Linked with Assessment
2.14 Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness minutes, 5.10.2012
2.15 Assessment Coordinator Job Announcement
2.16 Academic Senate minutes, 6.7.2012
2.17 August 2012 Workgroup and Task Force minutes
2.18 Assessment Day agenda, 8.24.2012
2.20 Institute Day Announcement/information on Marilee Bresciani, spring 2012
2.21 Assessment Student Services Institute Day, 1.6.2012
2.22 Outcomes Assessment Site
2.23 Outcomes Assessment Workgroup Minutes, 9.28.2012
**College Recommendation #5**

In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends the college strengthen and clarify the linkages and complete the cycle within the planning and budget process to ensure institutional effectiveness; engage in consistent systematic evaluation of the process; and codify, publish and adhere to the process. In addition, the college must integrate student learning outcome assessment results into the planning and budget process and strengthen the integration of technology planning with integrated planning and resource allocations. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7; II.A, II.B; III.C.2, III.D.1; ER10.)

---

**Responsible Workgroup**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenni Abbott (Administrator)</th>
<th>Allan McKissick (Faculty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Alavezos (Faculty)</td>
<td>Debbi Partridge (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Carroll (Faculty)</td>
<td>Martha Robles (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cripe (Faculty)</td>
<td>Kevin Sabo (Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Daly (Faculty)</td>
<td>Mike Sharif (Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanne Faughn (Classified)</td>
<td>Nancy Sill (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Guerra (Administrator)</td>
<td>Jill Stearns (Administrator)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Jones (Student)</td>
<td>Brenda Thames (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Kaiser (Administrator)</td>
<td>James Todd (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose LaMont (Faculty)</td>
<td>Joan Van Kuren (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice McKinnon (Administrator)</td>
<td>John Zamora (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Point Person(s)*

**Introduction**

Modesto Junior College strengthened and clarified the linkages within the planning and budget process through a variety of activities focused on improving institutional effectiveness. Allocation of resources based on program review and using the existing governance structure was assessed for its effectiveness. Weaknesses in the existing process were revealed. MJC moved forward to improve the resource allocation and effective planning through establishing new policies and procedures. A new governance structure based on decision making councils, and the reorganization of responsibilities for planning and budget, evolved through the revision of the Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory
Decision Making Handbook (also discussed in response six). The new process provides a flow of inputs and recommendation pathways leading to transparent decision making guidelines rooted in accountability and communication.

**Background on Resource Allocation and Budget Development**

Two processes over the past year illustrate the methods that MJC has used to inform resource allocation and the operational budget, based on the previous governance structure.

In October 2011 the college received one time monies totaling $950,000. Area deans were asked to submit funding requests to the office of instruction, based on program review requests. Although funding requests were generally taken from existing program reviews, it also became clear that in some instances requests were made without assessment based evidence, and without justification in program review. As an example, a total of $474,706 was allocated for supplies and equipment, with unspent funds designated as rollover for the next fiscal year.

Although the vice president of administrative services cross checked all funding requests to verify they were generated from program reviews before they were funded, it became apparent that some items were approved for funding outside of this established process [5.1]. The unexpected nature of this one time funding and the inability of the current system to properly inform these allocations through a due process revealed the weakness in the existing governance structure. It became readily apparent that MJC needed to improve its process.

In March 2012 MJC implemented a new approach to drive budget development, termed the four tiered system [5.2]. This system was immediately implemented in spring in order to develop and submit a balanced operational budget by April 16, 2012, per YCCD Board of Trustee guidelines [5.3]. Each department, division, and support area was asked to prioritize needs and costs based on four levels:

- Absolute must haves (mandated)
- Highly necessary (mission critical)
- Essential (should have)
- Desired (nice to have)

The results were brought forward to the Planning and Budget Committee at its March 30, 2012 meeting, where all deans were allotted time to present their needs to the group [5.4].

One goal of this new system was to bring the development of budget into a college wide dialogue. A second goal of this system was triage based planning of mandated and mission critical needs to inform the budget during fiscally lean times. A third goal was to provide a
framework in which additional requests were prioritized in advance for when funding did become available, thereby institutionalizing plans to drive expenditures.

The 2012-2013 final budget was submitted to the district and received tentative approval by the board of trustees in June 2012 and final approval September 2012 [5.5, 5.6, 5.7].

One weakness in this four tiered system was the use of the mandated and mission critical need designations. There was inconsistency across campus on how these labels were applied. A second difficulty was the tremendous amount of data produced. Over eighty programs or service areas each with four tiered rationales became difficult to quantify and manage in the Planning and Budget Committee. Ultimately the committee members had little opportunity to make informed recommendations on the budget.

**New Participatory Governance Structure at MJC**

Under the revised internal governance structure of the College, MJC has developed a new resource allocation system and planning process. The process institutionalizes decisions at multiple governing councils that ultimately make funding recommendations to the president.

Resource allocation for MJC begins at the district level. The district is fiscally balanced, and allocates resources to each college based on various formulas and funding sources. Some of these allocations are required to meet collective bargaining agreements and district strategic directions.

The start of the assessment, program review, and resource allocation cycle begins at the area level (instructional, service, and administrative). Each area evaluates its program using outcomes assessments to identify successes and areas for improvement. In this program review each area creates a list of needed resources, that includes personnel, equipment, technology, and facilities. Resource requests must be linked to the College mission, goals, or strategic initiative and must articulate how the funds will improve student learning and create meaningful program improvement.

Program review serves as the primary vehicle for resource requests from departments, areas, and divisions. Program review resource requests are first ranked at the Instruction Council (IC), Student Services Council (SSC) and the Facilities Council (FC). The College Technology Committee (CTC) informs and supports each council’s consideration of resource ranking so that technology is integrated into the allocation process of the institution. The Technology Plan, updated in spring 2012, establishes the process for guiding integrated technology planning at the College [5.8].

The funding requests at the councils are ranked using a program review rubric that quantifies how well the justifications support the prioritized goals of the college. The review process includes feedback to the originating area on the quality of the program review and the resource allocation rank assigned to the request.
The Resource Allocation Council (RAC) establishes guiding principles and priorities that lead decisions on funding requests. The RAC uses the College mission, goals, and institutional learning outcomes to develop the guiding principles and priorities. Using these guidelines, the RAC reviews the ranked lists from the IC, SSC, and FC and consolidates them into three ranked master lists (personnel, equipment, and technology) of items recommended for funding. The final recommendation for resource allocation occurs in the College Council (CC). This body reviews the final recommendations from the RAC. Final recommendations for resource allocation are made by CC to the president.

A process is under development by which areas not currently undergoing program review may bring forth resource allocation requests to the IC and SSC on the form provided by the office of administrative services. The form requires that resource allocation requests be tied directly to the College mission, goals, or other strategic initiative in support of improved student learning [5.9].

MJC has codified the planning and budgeting process in the Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory Decision Making Handbook with accompanying governance chart. These documents are made available publicly on the college website to ensure that the process is adhered to both when resources are plentiful and in times of decreased funding [5.10]. Members of the RAC are encouraged to share information with their constituencies regarding recommendations forwarded from the council to the president. A two-way flow of information into and out of the council is critical to maintaining transparency and clear communication across the College; further, it supports adherence to the established process.

MJC has taken a multifaceted approach to integrating student learning outcome assessment results into the planning and budget process. The RAC’s charge requires reliance on the results of program review and resource requests to inform budget development. To strengthen the tie between student learning outcomes assessment to resource allocation, the budget request forms have been modified to include a description of how the resource request links to desired outcomes, the college mission, goals, and strategic initiatives. Strategic initiatives include the priorities established in the MJC Educational Master Plan, MJC Technology Plan, MJC Distance Education Plan, and grant statements of work [5.11, 5.8, 5.12, 5.13].

Incorporation of the linkage between the resource request and outcomes assessment formally systematizes the role of assessment outcomes in resource allocation. Further, the allocation of resources to achieve student learning outcomes completes the loop of institutional planning in support of outcome achievement.
Future Actions

- RAC will review and refine its charge (see future actions with time line in response six).

- A time line will be determined for program review cycle and rubrics (IC, RAC, Academic Senate, spring 2013).

- The process for resource allocation requests outside of program review cycle will be implemented (RAC, fall 2013).
College Recommendation #5
Evidence cited

5.1 Copy onetime fund, first five pages
5.2 Funding Priorities Guidelines Sample
5.3 YCCD Board time frame for budget submissions
5.4 Planning and Budget Committee Minutes, 3.30.2012
5.5 Actual Prior 12-13, Budget Prior 12-13, Budget Difference
5.6 Board Minutes, 6.13.2012
5.7 Board Agenda, 9.12.2012
5.8 MJC Technology Plan, spring 2012
5.9 Expend Approval Justification Form
5.10 Governance and Planning Site
5.11 MJC Educational Master Plan, 2006-2007
5.12 Modesto Junior College Distance Education Plan 2012-2017
5.13 Hispanic Serving Institution Grant, Budget 2012-2017
College Recommendation #6

In order to meet the standard, the college must assess the current governance structure, review and implement changes to strengthen its infrastructure, and evaluate it on a regular basis. The team recommends the college develop a comprehensive participatory governance handbook that clearly identifies roles and responsibilities of participatory governance committees and constituent roles in the participatory process. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3.)

Responsible Workgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenni Abbott (Administrator)</th>
<th>Cece Hudelson-Putnam (Faculty)</th>
<th>Debi Bolter (Faculty)</th>
<th>Martha Robles (Administrator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Daly (Faculty)</td>
<td>Kevin Sabo (Student)</td>
<td>Lorena Dorn (Administrator)</td>
<td>Nora Seronello ( Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Dyrssen (Student)</td>
<td>Mike Sharif (Student)</td>
<td>Rosanne Faughn (Classified)</td>
<td>Tanya Smith (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Jones (Student)</td>
<td>Jill Steams (College President)</td>
<td>Bill Kaiser (Administrator)</td>
<td>Robert Stevenson (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kincade (Administrator)</td>
<td>Brenda Thames (Administrator)*</td>
<td>Maurice McKinnon (Administrator)</td>
<td>James Todd (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan McKissick (Faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debbi Partridge (Classified)</td>
<td>James Varble (Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Zamora (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Point Person(s)*

Introduction

Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory Decision Making Handbook was developed and written during spring, summer and fall 2012 [6.1]. Goals of the handbook include: clarification of the scope and role of each governance group (council); depiction of how decision making flowed among the groups; identification of the process for how an individual from the campus or the community puts forward ideas for institutional planning and performance; and articulation of how resource decisions are made. Collaboration, dialogue, and engagement in the writing of the handbook and the subsequent action plans that have been developed demonstrate that Modesto Junior College has addressed this recommendation.
Revising MJC’s Introduction to Decision Making at Modesto Junior College Fall 2008-2010 was a planning agenda item in MJC’s 2011 self study because the College’s policy for shared governance had expired. In fall 2012, the College developed an action plan to review and assess the existing governance structure. This evaluative process provided MJC with a shared understanding of existing structures and practices as well as highlighted the strengths and challenges of its internal governance structure. Through broad institutional dialogue the College was then able to identify changes necessary to improve the governance structure.

**Achieving Institutional Goals and Values**

Decision making at MJC relies heavily upon the spirit and principles of good faith and collegial, participatory governance, while maintaining the focus as a student centered teaching and learning environment. Members of the MJC community have the authority and responsibility to make recommendations in matters appropriate in scope to their roles in the College governance process.

This participatory governance is guided by the College’s institutional values, which fosters respect and interest in innovation, professionalism, integrity, responsible stewardship, diverse individuals, and community histories.

**Background on the Governance Structure at MJC**

The board of trustees is the ultimate decision maker on district wide policies and master plans. The board delegates to the chancellor and the president final approval of campus administrative procedures, operational issues, and strategic plans.

Historically at Modesto Junior College, the College Council routed governance issues to and received recommendations from the constituent groups and governance committees. Academic and professional matters as outlined in AB 1725, Title 5 and board policy were sent through the Academic Senate, operational issues to the councils and divisions, and working conditions issues to collective bargaining units. However, the role of the College Council had slowly dissolved over the last few years as participatory governance decisions began to happen out of the process, thereby obscuring how decisions were being made.

Standing committees historically performed organizational functions that benefited the MJC community, and they served as recommending bodies to the College Council and other areas of MJC within their respective charges. For example the Distance Education Advisory Committee is charged with all issues intertwined with distance education. Councils
have historically been distinguished from committees as governance bodies that coordinate operations and procedures of the college, and served as recommending bodies to the main council, College Council.

Description of Process to Clarify the Governance Structure at MJC

On December 5, 2011 College Council discussed plans to restructure governance at MJC, following a review of the preliminary accreditation report [6.2]. The plans were further discussed in Academic Senate [6.3] and two Joint Council Executives meetings composed of the major leadership group members of the College Council, Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the Planning and Budget Committee, along with the executive boards of the constituency groups [6.4, 6.5]. Discussion also occurred within the constituency groups between the December and January meetings [6.6, 6.7, 6.8].

Discussion focused on the following changes:

- Separate the planning process from the current Planning and Budget Committee to the College Council.
- Rename the Planning and Budget Committee to Resource Allocation Committee, shift it from an Academic Senate committee to a college wide committee, and limit the committee’s charge to making recommendations regarding resource management and allocation.

At the January 30, 2012 meeting, a draft of an organizational flowchart was presented to address the revised decision making process for institutional planning and budget development. This diagram titled Participatory Governance at Modesto Junior College was the initial step at clarifying the roles of two governance groups, College Council and Planning and Budget, to better inform and direct budget allocation and to solidify institutional effectiveness [6.9]. The draft organization flowchart as recommended by the College president and delineated in Academic Senate Resolution SP-12 B placed the College Council as the central shared governance group regarding college issues and the planning and budget cycle [6.10]. In a subsequent Academic Senate meeting, the drafting of revised guidelines on institutional decision making was addressed. Model language for the decision making handbook was developed, including how to better define ‘rely primarily’ and ‘mutually agree’ (the 10+1 areas of interest in the California Educational Code), and how to resolve issues where consensus among the Academic Senate and administration is not reached [6.11, 6.12, 6.13].

At the Joint Council meeting on January 30, 2012 a workgroup was developed to write a new shared governance handbook to capture processes at MJC and to reflect these revisions in the
internal governance structure. The members represented all constituency groups on campus. The completion of this handbook project became a major objective of the institution for the following several months.

**Workgroup**

The participatory governance handbook workgroup first met on February 16, 2012 [6.14]. Over the course of seven months, the workgroup regularly assembled and participated in compression planning sessions, and meted out assignments for documenting the process of decision making at MJC [6.15, 6.16, 6.17, 6.18]. All the while, representatives from the constituency groups were reporting back on the progress to their respective bodies, drafting and vetting sections, and identifying model language for the handbook [e.g., 6.6, 6.7, 6.11-13]. In addition, workgroup members attended a technical assistance presentation on August 29, 2012, titled *Participating Effectively in District and College Government (The Law, Regulations and Guidelines)* given by Michelle Pilati, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and Scott Lay, Community College League of California [6.19].

The workgroup developed a draft of a handbook that included guidelines that examined and documented decision making processes and structures, delineated committee and council charges, identified all constituency groups, and provided a template of the way that individuals can become empowered in the decision making process. Overall, the handbook identified four foundational elements to decision making at Modesto Junior College: Good faith effort, groups that develop recommendations, time lines and sequences for key college decisions, and communication to college stakeholders.

The workgroup presented the drafted handbook to College Council on August 20, 2012 [6.20]. The handbook workgroup disbanded after this date, as it had completed its charge. The workgroup forwarded a series of recommendations to the College Council to finalize the document, including the following:

- Increase the membership on the College Council to include a representative from all committees, constituency groups and councils, and increase the Student Senate to two representatives.
- Limit any one individual’s representation on College Council to two representative roles (and only 1 vote).
- Clarify the roles of councils and committees.
• Review the following groups in light of the council / committee clarification:
  Facilities Committee, Classified Staff Advisory Council, College Technology
  Committee, and College Management Council.

• Adopt best practices for committee chairs and members.

• Adopt a standing College Council agenda item on participatory shared
governance.

• Post agendas and minutes of councils and committees in a centralized way
(online) for ease of access.

• Recommend that each governance body develop and implement an annual
assessment process of their structure, charge, and processes for continuous
improvement.

• Conduct an annual review of the Participatory Decision Making Handbook and
associated processes.

After discussion in College Council on August 20, 2012, and based on the recommendations
from the workgroup, the president made revisions to the handbook and presented it to the
campus in early September 2012 [6.21]. Additional feedback and discussion ensued in
College Council, two campus forums, and a special meeting between administration and
the Academic Senate Executive Board [6.22, 6.23, 6.24, 6.25]. Based on this dialogue,
additional suggestions were incorporated into another revision, dated September 14, 2012
[6.26]. On September 17, 2012 College Council voted to use this revised proposal as the
working handbook draft, and asked constituency groups to gather additional comments,
feedback, and edits in order to finalize the handbook [6.27]. The revised handbook was
further discussed in the Academic Senate, who endorsed the revised handbook with noted
areas for continued discussion [6.28].

All constituency feedback was reviewed in College Council on September 24, 2012 and also
in a separate meeting between the Academic Senate president and MJC’s president [6.29,
6.30]. Additional comments were incorporated into a September 27, 2012 revision that was
discussed in Academic Senate later that day [6.31]. On October 1, 2012 College Council
discussed the September 27, 2012 draft, approving two additional recommendations from
the Academic Senate, although there was not consensus on all recommendations or the final
product [6.32].

The Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook is housed on the
College’s website, under the Governance and Planning page [6.1]. An email with a link to
the handbook was sent out campus wide by the president on October 8, 2012.
Summary and Conclusions

The decision making handbook, Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory Decision-Making Handbook, serves as evidence that the College has engaged in collegial discussion on some very complex issues pertaining to participatory governance and decision making processes at MJC. Shared meaning and a collective understanding of decision making structures and processes have been developed through these discussions across faculty, staff, administration, and student groups. Controversial issues that have been sources of disagreement and division within the campus community have begun to be explored and discussed. All of these issues have not been resolved. However, the handbook provides a foundation upon which the college can continue to build insight and understanding that will facilitate change and growth. This will lead to further improvement of decision making structures and processes through which the College will be able to effectively address issues.

Future Actions

• By November 16, 2012 membership on each of the six councils will be established (constituency groups);

• By March 1, 2013, each council will review and refine its charge, responsibilities, and processes (College Council, Instruction Council, Facilities Council, Accreditation Council, Resource Allocation Council, Student Services Council);

• During spring 2014, the handbook will be reviewed, assessed, and evaluated (College Council).
### College Recommendation #6

**Evidence cited**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Electronic Handbook File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>College Council Meeting Minutes, 12.5.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 12.8.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Joint Meeting Minutes, 12.19.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Joint Exec/Council Meeting Minutes, 1.30.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>California School Employees Association, Meeting Minutes, 2.16.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 1.19.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Participatory Governance at Modesto Junior College: Flowchart, 1.30.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Academic Senate Resolution SP-12 B, 3.1.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 3.1.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 3.29.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, 6.7.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>Participatory governance meeting minutes, 2.16.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>Compression Planning Summary #1, 3.26.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>Compression Planning Summary #2 4.4.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>Compression Planning Summary #3, 5.2.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>Compression Planning Summary #4, 5.24.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>Participating Effectively in District and College Governance, 4.4.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>College Council Minutes 8.20.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Academic Senate Minutes, 9.6.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>College Council Minutes, 9.10.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>College Council Minutes, 9.17.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>Academic Senate Minutes, 9.20.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>College Council Minutes, 9.24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>Email from J. Stearns to College Council, 9.27.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>Academic Senate Minutes, 9.27.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>College Council Minutes, 10.1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**College Recommendation #7**

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college develop and implement a distance education plan as identified in the Substantive Change Report, 2010. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3.)

**Responsible Workgroup**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenni Abbott* (Administrator)</th>
<th>Eva Mo (Faculty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim Bailey (Faculty)</td>
<td>Lawrence Scheg (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Bettencourt* (Administrator)</td>
<td>Kim Schrader (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Carroll (Faculty)</td>
<td>Nora Seronello (Classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Chavez (Classified)</td>
<td>Mary Silva (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Clarke (Faculty)</td>
<td>Michael Smedshammer (Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena Dorn (Administrator)</td>
<td>Michael Sundquist (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ellis (Classified)</td>
<td>Brenda Thames (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Gyuran (Faculty)</td>
<td>John Williams (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Maki (Faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Point Persons

Modesto Junior College approved a comprehensive distance education plan on April 16, 2012, which is now being implemented [7.1].

The collaborative effort to develop the distance education plan began in the spring of 2011. In order to identify best practices in the structure of distance education operations, the college conducted a telephone survey of the 112 California Community Colleges [7.2]. Cohort colleges were identified based on size and demographics [7.3]. MJC online success and retention rates were compared to colleges in the cohort, and the number of support staff in cohort colleges was used as a model for the MJC online staffing plan.

In December 2011, college stakeholders began meeting to identify gaps related to distance learning at the college [7.4]. Twenty-five faculty, staff, and administrators discussed and prioritized the challenges in three areas: 1) student preparation; 2) faculty preparation; and 3) infrastructure and services. Over the next eight weeks, the Distance Education Advisory Committee held multiple discussions to develop a comprehensive distance education plan. Based on the gaps that were identified, national best practices, ACCJC Standards, and results of MJC surveys and research, four specific areas and goals were developed [7.5, 7.6]:

---

*Modesto Junior College – 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report*
1. Student Support: Deliver online support services for students, including those enrolled in distance education courses, to persist and succeed in their educational goals.

2. Faculty Support: Establish minimum standards and provide initial and ongoing faculty training and support to effectively teach online and hybrid courses.

3. Technology and Infrastructure: Acquire, maintain, and support technologies that increase the effectiveness of distance learning.

4. Governance, Guidelines, and Budget: Establish governance, guidelines, and budget standards to effectively implement and monitor the college distance education program.

Small workgroups were created to research and draft sections of the plan, including specific objectives and a time line for each goal. The plan includes a recommended staffing structure and services to be incorporated into the distance education operation. The committee met bi-weekly to review and revise the draft. The plan was submitted to College Council on March 5, 2012 for review [7.7]. Council members shared the plan with constituencies and returned feedback [7.8, 7.9]. The final plan was approved by Academic Senate on March 29, 2012 [7.10] and College Council on April 16, 2012 [7.11].

The MJC Distance Education Plan 2012-2017 demonstrates the College’s commitment to meeting the mission of the institution and upholding its integrity through the delivery of online education. The distance education mission statement aligns with the district and college missions and the MJC Technology Plan 2011 [7.1, 7.12]. To ensure alignment of the MJC Distance Education Plan 2012-2017 with the Standards, significant research was conducted regarding effective practices recommended in the WASC Distance Education Policy Revised for 2011.

**Distance Education Plan Implementation**

The College’s distance education plan recommended the creation of a full time position for a faculty instructional design coordinator, which the College has funded [7.13]. The role of the position is to develop and deliver training, design templates for faculty to use in course design, review online courses and recommend improvements, and provide pedagogical support to faculty. The position was filled by an experienced online faculty member, who was recently awarded a national Blackboard Catalyst Award for Exemplary Course Design [7.14]. During the months of June and July 2012, the College undertook a comprehensive review of all online courses scheduled to be taught in the fall 2012 semester [7.15, 7.16]. A rubric was developed based on best practice models including Quality Matters, iNACOL Standards, and
the Blackboard Exemplary Course Rubric [7.17]. Courses were reviewed using the normed rubric and results were shared with each instructor, dean, and the vice president of instruction [7.18]. Ninety-five courses received recommendations for improvement, primarily to include a Start Here module [7.19]. Support and training were provided by peer mentors and the instructional design coordinator. Modified courses were reviewed by the area dean and vice president of instruction, and those few online courses that did not align with the rubric were removed from the fall 2012 schedule [7.20].

The Distance Education Advisory Committee established the following priorities:

- Course review: A workgroup is developing a time line and process for regular course review to ensure consistent quality improvement of online courses. The review includes consideration of survey data from faculty who participated in the summer online course review process [7.21, 7.22].

- Online course standards: A workgroup is reviewing and revising the online course design rubric including online pedagogy and student accessibility [7.21].

- Learning management system (LMS) evaluation: The committee in collaboration with YCCD and Columbia College is currently investigating multiple LMS options to determine the most effective platform for student success. This includes a semester-long pilot in two different LMS platforms and student surveys [7.23].

- Online student support services: A third workgroup is developing a single online site for MJC student services based on the model from Portland Community College [7.24].
College Recommendation #7
Evidence cited

7.1 Modesto Junior College Distance Education Plan 2012-2017
7.2 MJC Distance Education Survey: California Community Colleges, Spring 2011
7.3 Analysis of Data Retrieved from the California Community College DataMart
7.4 DE Discussion Summary, 12.16.2011
7.5 Distance Ed Summary #2, 1.20.12
7.6 Distance Ed Summary #3, 2.3.2012
7.7 College Council Minutes, 3.5.2012
7.8 Academic Senate Minutes, 3.15.2012
7.9 College Council Minutes, 3.19.2012
7.10 Academic Senate Minutes, 3.29.2012
7.11 College Council Minutes, 4.16.2012
7.12 Modesto Junior College Technology Plan Fall 2011
7.13 Instructional Design Coordinator Position
7.14 Blackboard Award
7.15 Email Online Course Rubric Results, J. Fay, 6.20.2012
7.16 http://www.mjc.edu/general/president/Accreditation/deac_minutes_6_26_12.pdf
7.17 MJC Online Course Review Rubric for Minimum Standards, Fall 2012
7.18 Email to Deans re: Course Review, J. Fay, 6.27.2012
7.19 Start Here Module
7.20 Excel Sheet from Jim Fay Listing Courses Approved for Fall 2012 and Those Switched to On-Campus
7.21 DE Advisory Committee Minutes, 8.9.12
7.22 Online Faculty Survey Results
7.23 Canvas Survey Results
7.24 Portland Community College Online Student
College Recommendation #8

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends the college develop a consistent, transparent, and readily available tracking system that documents evaluations for faculty and tracks progress in order to verify performance improvement. (Standards III.A.1.a, III.A.1.b, III.A.5.a, III.A.6.)

Responsible Workgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark Anglin (Administrator)</th>
<th>Pedro Mendez (Administrator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorena Dorn (Administrator)</td>
<td>Brian Sanders (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fay (Administrator)*</td>
<td>Patrick Bettencourt (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cece Hudelson-Putnam (Administrator)</td>
<td>Mike Sundquist (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Kaiser (Administrator)</td>
<td>John Williams (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice McKinnon (Administrator)</td>
<td>Diane Wirth (Administrator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Point Persons

The YCCD office of human resources created a comprehensive evaluation tracking system for all full time faculty, completed over the summer of 2012. The spreadsheets contain the name of the faculty member, employee type, the date of the last evaluation, the date of the next evaluation, and the name of the manager responsible for the evaluation [8.1]. All adjunct faculty evaluations are now tracked in the office of the vice president of instruction, using a spreadsheet with the date of the last evaluation, each semester taught, and date of the next evaluation [8.2].

At the beginning of each semester the district office will notify the president of full time faculty evaluations to take place that upcoming semester [8.3]. Faculty evaluations occur on the following time line, as outlined in Yosemite Faculty Association contract, Article Six (full time) and Article Seven (adjunct) [8.4, 8.5]. Full time, tenured faculty are evaluated in a three year cycle, during spring semester. Full time, non tenured faculty are evaluated every year during the first four years of service. Temporary full time faculty are evaluated during the first semester of their employment contract. Adjunct faculty are evaluated in the first semester of employment, and then once every six teaching semesters thereafter (either fall or spring). The president will forward the notification of full time faculty evaluations to be completed for a given semester to the vice president of instruction, who will then advise the vice president of student services and the deans to complete. For adjunct faculty the vice president of instruction will track and advise the vice president of student services...
and the deans on which evaluations to complete. Faculty members who wish to know their own evaluation schedule can access this information from their dean. The office of the vice president of instruction monitors the evaluation process to ensure that all of the evaluations take place as required.

The full time faculty evaluation master lists are housed in the office of the vice chancellor of human resources where they are updated on a semester basis. Adjunct faculty evaluation master lists are housed in the office of the vice president of instruction and are updated on a semester basis. The office of the vice president of instruction reports to the vice chancellor of human resources at the end of each semester with all completed faculty evaluations for that semester.
College Recommendation Eight

Evidence cited

8.1 Full time faculty spreadsheet example
8.2 Adjunct faculty spreadsheet example
8.3 Faculty evaluations memo, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources
8.4 YFA contract, Article Six
8.5 YFA contract, Article Seven