**Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

**Friday, November 16, 2018**

**2:00 pm**

**In Attendance:**

**Committee Members:** Sarina Torres (CSEA Representative), Katherine Guhin (Classified Senate President Designee), Dale van Dam (VP of Instruction/ALO/Co-Chair), Darlene Murray (Strategic Planning) Amanda Taintor (SLO Coordinator), Renee Craig-Marius (VP of Student Services-Ex-Officio), Michael Newton (Faculty Rep), Adelfa Lorenzano (Student Success Committee Rep),

**Not Present:** Stephanie Curry (Academic Senate President), Vacant (Faculty/Co-Chair) Donna Berry (President-Ex-Officio), Janice Offenbach (Director of Institutional Research, Evaluation & Planning), Gregory Ramirez (MCCC/OCCC Faculty Accreditation Coordinator) Claudia Habib (VP Madera & Oakhurst CCC)**,**

**Other Present**: None

**Writing Teams Present**: None

**Review Meeting Notes 10.19.18**

* Didn’t see link from Janice for webinar, Dale will ask her to resend
* Send Sarina any changes

**Update on Co-Chair**

* Dale and Sarina prioritized list and contacted 4 people
  + Vanessa Buldo
  + John Heathcote
  + Richell Swallow
  + Louie Long
* Vanessa, John, Richell all declined. Still waiting for answer from Louie
* If he declines, will select another four

**Update on Progress of Follow Up Report**

* Response to Action Letter, III.A.5 District Recommendation 2
  + Complete draft
  + All colleges will use this language and add in what colleges are doing
* Christine’s draft
  + Initial draft of IIIC2-technology plan
  + Had original language from team not commission
  + ACCJC more interested in process of review
  + Dale let Christine know what she wrote to was old language
  + Going to use Christine’s draft but switch focus to creation of process
  + This is a review of the program of a whole
    - Compile and prioritize in a systematic way
    - Not asking us to write a program review
    - Preface response with that wording
  + 2 reps from FCC
  + 2 reps from CCC
  + Dale working on
  + There could be a college supplemental portion to add
  + No real draft of tech recommendation yet
* Evaluation Recommendation Draft
  + ready for this committee input
  + send Dale any concerns or comments, any info that will help with colleges process

**Questions from Program Review Committee**

* difficult to figure out what part of EMP to write to
* suggest removing or being more specific
* why are we not writing how each program meets Equity goals
* analysis portion asks something about Equity
* very redundant for person writing
* value in aligning to mission
* Should each program have a mission statement in addition to PLO/Service Area Outcome?
* Some already do, some don’t
* Can’t see value in all cases
* Trying to narrow down and make more succinct
* Could allow box for those who have one, but not require
* Non-instructional may have them more as guidance
* a) no 1 is sufficient as is
* b) made an option, but not required
* Each program in a meta major speak to meta major mission statement
* An there be a more specific question on how meeting equity gap
  + Bring to PR committee-Julie Kehoe

**ISS Update**

* Tabled

**Update on MCCC Accreditation Progress**

* The BOT approval of the eligibility report's second reading;
* The ISER writing teams are at work to where meeting the December 14 deadline doesn't appear to be a problem;
* While I need to finalize it, Madera is contemplating having its first open forum related to accreditation on Wednesday, December 5.

**Other**

**Next Meeting: December 7, 2018**