1. Approval of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes

3. Continuing Action and Discussion Items
   a. Program Review
   b. Board Policy Review and Comment – First Reading
      Policy #3310 – Records Retention and Destruction
      Policy #7232 – Classification Review

4. New Business Action and Discussion Items
   a. Assessment Cycle Scheduling– James Todd
   b. Accreditation Update
   c. Introduction of Guiding Principles Document
   d. Selection of College Council Representative

5. Standing Reports
   a. College Council

6. Public Comments

7. Announcements

8. Adjournment
SUBSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Member Substituting for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Todd</td>
<td>Chair of Outcomes Assessment Work Group &amp; Academic Senate President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUSINESS

1. Approval of Agenda
   In deference to guest, James Todd, K. Kennard moved and J. Beebe seconded a motion to move Item 4.A. Assessment Cycle Scheduling – James Todd, between Items 2 and 3. Hearing no objections, the order of the agenda was approved as amended.
2. Approval of Minutes
   J. Netto moved and E. Kerr seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the January 29, 2013 meeting of the Instruction Council. Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

3. Continuing Action and Discussion Items
   a. Program Review
   S. Kincade reported. She is more educated about Program Review (PR) after meeting with B. Sanders and talking with everybody. She feels there are still some conversations that need to take place regarding PR. In the past, PR dealt with departments and not with programs. When do we become self-reflective as faculty? Where are first-year students having problems? Are they taking classes in the wrong sequence? Where are they bottlenecking? We cannot reflect back on courses or our degree programs because we have not had that emphasis before. How much closer do we need to drill down in course level and program level outcomes to find out where courses need to be tweaked? ACCJC will probably determine for us how much closer we need to drill down on our data. Instead of a department level which is like a unit program review, we need to get a degree-level PR which includes degrees, certificates, AA/AS. Some institutions include the General Education and everyone meets. Program Review needs to be prepared at the degree (or program) level from a student’s perspective. We need to be able to pull data for use in reporting instead of pulling data and pulling data and pulling data again for each report.

   The question was asked, “What is Program Review?” Many ideas came forth. Is it how many faculty, equipment and supplies that are needed? Is it reviewing the process of how the student gets to his/her goal? What is it that makes our students successful in going out to the job market or transfer or as they complete one level and go on to the next level? We will be piloting some PLOs for PR. ACCJC is more interested in tracking completion of emphasis or achievement. Data should be kept as comprehensive as possible.

   We need to separate unit/department PR from program review. How will we continue with unit review since that is the process we have in place? Generally the group liked the idea of splitting out data so it can be looked at for all programs within units and outside of units. How do people see creating groups to look at those programs? Is it the same group from the unit? It can become a complicated and political process if you are not careful about it.

   What we have in place is a “unit-planning” instrument that we call Program Review. Unit review should be done separately from a review of programs. It should be checking the integrity of the degree or certificate versus looking at each different department. There are two very different ways of looking at PR. Should we continue on as an annual unit review?

   When we talk about the integrity of the courses and the programs, this is a question that needs to be answered at the faculty level. Historically, PR at MJC has been the source used to determine resource allocation. If we did a degree PR as well as a unit PR, would they both
feed into resource allocation? Resource allocation needs to be a separate conversation. Divisions need an operating budget and a plan for adding faculty. We need to move forward while we are making adjustments.

In a month, S. Kincade has an annual report due to ACCJC. There are 46 questions of which 30 are new to the report. The report asks what is your institution set standard for success, what is your institution set percentage for persistence, and what is a successful student? R. Stevenson stated that it will be a long conversation with many different groups for next year's cycle. M. Morales suggested that we Beta Test one single program, work on it and fix it and then use it. R. Stevenson suggested we bring back Program Review as an on-going item on the Instruction Council agenda and continue the conversation.

A launch date for this year’s annual unit-planning cycle needs to be scheduled.

**Action Item:**

| Who: | A. Bethel |
| What: | Set Program Review as an on-going agenda item |

b. **Board Policy Review and Comment – First Reading**

**Policy #3310**

Good news! The President by accident went ahead and called on the question of the reading of Policy #3310. This policy can go forward as written. There are still questions as to what needs to come to the new councils or not.

M. Morales requested clarification of what the “maps” were on the Class 3 list of documents.

**Action Item:**

| Who: | S. Kincade |
| What: | Will get clarification of “maps” on Class 3 list of documents and email this information to the IC membership |

**Policy #7232**

Policy #7232 has been referred back to the District’s Policy and Procedures Committee for more clarification and corrections. This policy will come back to us later.

4. **New Business Action and Discussion Items**

a. **Assessment Cycle Scheduling**

James Todd, Chair of the Outcomes Assessment Work Group (OAW) reported. He came to the Instruction Council meeting to report what is going on in assessment. Assessment is only going to get bigger and bigger and bigger. It is not going to shrink. We are not great at it yet. There is one representative from each division on the OAW. Some members are new and the work group is getting acclimated. He would like to come to Instruction Council often to keep the Council informed on assessment. As we grow in assessment, things like Program Review (PR)
and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are going to come closer together. The Curriculum Committee has approved a new matrix for curriculum review. The challenge was to put assessment in concert with the new matrix. The traditional formula is that Assessment informs Program Review informs Curriculum. Since we don’t know where we are on PR, it is Assessment that is informing Curriculum. Assessment is supposed to help us make strategic choices in the way we design our classes. Every discipline is on the curriculum matrix. Every department on campus received a five-year assessment schedule for their discipline. Using the discipline of History as an example, in Fall 2015 on the Curriculum Matrix, they are submitting all their courses for curriculum review. The semester before their curriculum is due for review, they are not going to be assessing their courses at that point. They will be assessing their PLOs. You would also be looking at some General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) if there is an AA-T. The semester they would have off is the spring before Fall 2015. Faculty also received a long email from J. Todd explaining the four items that need to be completed. 1) Look in PiratesNet and be sure your Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) are correct, 2) Check your PLOs in the catalog if you have a program (certificates and degrees) and be sure they are correct, 3) Look at the relationship between CLOs and PLOs (If any of these three items are not correct, go into CurricUNET and revise them. The Assessment Work Group will review and approve and forward on to PiratesNet), and 4) Schedule the assessments of your CLOs and align them with your curriculum cycle. A future goal is to have CLO assessment publicly available. J. Todd stated there are over 3,000 CLOs for this college and most of them are in PiratesNet and CurricUNET.

b. Accreditation Update
S. Kincade reported. She and several faculty (J. Todd, E. Dambrosio, D. Bolter and J. Hamilton) attended the Accreditation Institute last week sponsored by the State Academic Senate. She noted that when Barbara Beno spoke, it was blunt. During the Hot Topics Q & A, she was equally blunt. Her bluntness underscored the fact of how much work we need to do. We will hear tomorrow what level of sanction we will have. S. Kincade believes we will stay on probation. She reported that when teams come through to check our work on the three standards, if something else comes to their attention, the team can create a new recommendation for follow up.

c. Introduction of Guiding Principles Document
Tabled to next meeting

**Action Item:**

**Who:** A. Bethel  
**What:** Place “Introduction of Guiding Principles Document” to next agenda

d. Selection of College Council Representative
Deborah Laffranchini volunteered to represent the Instruction Council at College Council. Hearing no objections, this was approved.
5. Standing Reports
   a. College Council
      D. Laffranchini reported. B. Sanders gave a well-received presentation on the Science Community Center and Planetarium. He will also present it to the YCCD Board of Trustees at its February 13, 2013 meeting. The emphasis of the presentation is that this facility is for everyone’s use.

   Action Item:
   Who: S. Kincade
   What: Will confer with J. Sigman to create an online repository for college-related presentations.

6. Public Comments
   J. Todd reminded the Instruction Council of the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) Building Session on Wednesday, February 13, 2013 at the Mary Stuart Rogers Learning Center.

   It was mentioned that Richard Serros worked on the art work of the constellations on the new Planetarium.

   L. Dorn requested that the Instruction Council take a look at the Student Success Initiative and aligning course offerings to student needs.

   Action Item:
   Who: A. Bethel
   What: Add Student Success Initiative to a future Instruction Council agenda

   S. Kincade will send the ARCC report to all members.

   Action Item:
   Who: S. Kincade
   What: Send ARCC report to Instruction Council members

7. Announcements
   There were no announcements.

8. Adjournment
   M. Adams moved and J. Hughes seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. Hearing no objections, motion passed.
Instruction Council

Members: Mike Adams, Mark Anglin, Jeff Beebe, Lorena Dorn, Eric Fischer, Julie Hughes, Kimberly Kennard, Eileen Kerr, Susan Kincade (Chair), Deborah Laffranchini, Mike Morales, Jeff Netto, Brian Sanders, Rob Stevenson (Co-Chair), Michael Sundquist, James Varble (ASMJC), Francisco Villasenor (ASMJC), Pat Wallace

AGENDA
February 26, 2013
Yosemite 213, 3:30 - 5 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Approval of Agenda
   b. Approval of Minutes

III. CONTINUING BUSINESS
   a. Program Review

IV. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Introduction to Guiding Principles

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   a. Policy #3310 – Records Retention and Destruction
   b. Student Success Initiative – Martha Robles

VI. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS
   a. College Council
   b. Accreditation Council
   c. Student Services Council
   d. Resource Allocation Council
   e. Facilities Council
   f. Senate Report
   g. Student Report
   h. Staff Report

VII. ADJOURNMENT
I. Call to Order
S. Kincade called the meeting to order at 3:35.

II. Action Items
   a. Approval of Agenda
R. Stevenson asked to postpone Informational Item, Student Success Initiative. He then made a motion which was seconded by J. Netto to approve the Agenda as revised. Motion carried unanimously.

b. Approval of Minutes
D. Laffranchini moved and M. Adams seconded a motion to accept the minutes of 2/12/13 as presented. Motion carried unanimously. S. Kincade thanked Pat Wallace for her assistance in taking the minutes.

III. Continuing Business
a. Program Review
S. Kincade opened the topic by saying that she and Rob wanted to provide an opportunity for continued discussion on Program Review. They want to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to be fully heard.

D. Laffranchini noted that she talked with several faculty members since the last meeting who expressed concern that if fiscal needs are not included in Program Review, those needs may not be met if/when funds become available. J. Netto added that he feels that it may be a step back if we do not include funding in the Program Review. S. Kincade went to the white board to illustrate an example of how the Program Review, Assessment and Curriculum cycles might inter-relate and work together to facilitate Continuous Quality Improvement.

E. Kerr asked why requests for faculty hires would not be included in Program Review. She explained that her program has little cost except faculty. S. Kincade answered that faculty requests should not go into Program Review as they should only have to go to College Council, RAC and Academic Senate. Susan asked where those requests currently go. B. Sanders described the previous processes.

The former prioritization process began at the division level. Division priorities were then forwarded to an “expanded” IAC (IAC plus representatives from Academic Senate, YFA and CSEA). Deans were given the opportunity to present their rationale for their requests for hire to the expanded group. The requests were then prioritized by the group. A finalized, prioritized list was then forwarded to the Planning and Budget Committee (now known as the Resource Allocation Council). Counseling faculty were ranked with Student Services and were not included with instructional faculty prioritization. The prioritized list was then forwarded to the Academic Senate who could suggest changes and then to the President who could also suggest changes.

Debi Bolter asked why Academic Senate does not approve faculty hires. There was discussion of whether or not Academic Senate approved faculty hires. R. Stevenson added that the Academic Senate had created a formal position requesting that riffed faculty be hired back and eliminated programs restored before hiring any additional new faculty.
D. Laffranchini asked about restoration of faculty in divisions experiencing retirements or resignations. M. Morales added that in conversations with his faculty, they are feeling frustration that the process is changing again and asked to be notified once a process is established. The core of the issue is that in the past we were told if it’s not in your Program Review, you won’t get it. The rub is that we do not have a different process in place. R. Stevenson added that we have not yet assessed our Program Reviews and asked how we can move forward if we have not assessed our instructional program reviews. He would like to take the topic of faculty hiring to the Academic Senate for discussion.

R. Stevenson asked how we compile the list of faculty hires for consideration. He suggested that the Instruction Council would be a good place to develop an initial list of faculty hires. It was suggested that Academic Senate and the Instruction Council make recommendations to College Council. Review of programs and degrees should also be part of this body’s responsibility.

It is important to note that this will be the first year that PLO Assessments results will inform Program Review. According to the Accreditation Report, this piece has been missing from our processes. S. Kincade and President Stearns will meet with James Todd on Monday to draft his vision for how Assessment works with Program Review. There was discussion that although last year’s items were funded from the PR lists, what was missing was that Assessment did not inform the PR process. This is the year that we should be able to assess how those purchases have improved our programs.

R. Stevenson moved to ask the Academic Senate to begin a conversation and host a study session to determine what data is needed to begin to assessment on programs. The IC Chair and co-chair will facilitate and assist as requested in the study sessions. M. Adams seconded the motion. Discussion followed.

J. Varble asked if we have a Research Office to provide the necessary information. He also asked how the Curriculum Committee will be involved in the process. S. Kincade answered that Nora Seronello is 50% MJC Researcher and will be available to assist. Student Services can provide information on transfers, degrees and certificates. There is also information that is regularly reported to the state which can be used as well. The Curriculum Committee would be part of the conversation as curricular changes might also be required. The Outcomes Assessment Workgroup members would be more important in the beginning stages.

L. Dorn asked how Unit Level Outcomes will be incorporated into this process. R. Stevenson answered that he felt the Unit Level Outcomes are also important. Academic Senate would direct what data needs to be used for Program Review. It was determined that we will continue with one more cycle of Program Review as we have in the past with Division and Unit Level Reviews. This year we have several areas who are piloting the new Program Review cycle. K. Kennard
added that she would like to see a Standard Rubric that can be modified to fit individual disciplines.

M. Anglin added that in the past each division had at least two people trained in program mapping who could show which learning outcomes were relevant to which course and faculty would have to remember which PLO are applicable to which program. D. Lafranchini asked for examples of Unit Review. R. Stevenson answered that unit review applies to non-instructional departments and the operation of division offices as a whole.

D. Bolter asked that a timeline be added so that she can include specific information in the Accreditation Report. S. Kincade added that all we can do at this time all we can do is provide evidence that we are improving.

Motion passed unanimously after discussion.

**Action Item:**

Who: R. Stevenson, S. Kincade
What: Ask the Academic Senate to begin a faculty-wide conversation and host a study session to recommend what data is needed to begin to assessment on programs. The IC Chair and co-chair will facilitate and assist as requested in the study sessions.

IV. New Business

a. **Introduction to Guiding Principles**

A copy of the Guiding Principles from the Resource Allocation Council was distributed. S. Kincade asked if there were council members who would be willing to help develop Guiding Principles for the Instruction Council. J. Netto, J. Varble, M. Adams will develop a draft.

There was further discussion of the purpose of the Guiding Principles. S. Kincade stated that she sees the Principles as describing the decision making process the council will follow.

**Action Item:**

Who: J. Netto, J. Varble and M. Adams
What: Develop a draft “Guiding Principles” for the Instruction Council

V. Informational Items

a. **Policy #3310 – Records Retention and Destruction**

S. Kincade noted that she had sent the definition from Title V of Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 records to the group. It was noted that when the records keeping process was shifted from Admissions & Records to the division offices there was some confusion as to how long records should be kept. In general it is 3 years after the record is created. Maps should be kept forever to show where things are under the
ground. M. Morales stated that he has had issues when he is working the ground. S. Kincade directed him to Tim Nesmith in Facilities for maps.

VI. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS
It was agreed that council/constituent representatives should relate timely, relevant highlights rather than each rep giving a full report at each meeting. The minutes of each council will suffice for full reporting.

a. College Council
D. Laffranchini reported that the Accreditation Report was the topic.

b. Accreditation Council
The Action Letter and Letter from Team Chair, Dr. Roquemore was shared by S. Kincade. She reviewed each recommendation. S. Kincade will ask Susan Clifford for clarification of Recommendation 2 and ask to have Recommendation 7 removed. The annual report is due March 31 in which we need to establish an institutional standard for student achievement.

c. Student Services Council
The Matriculation Workgroup was changed to the Student Success Workgroup. Priority Registration will need to be changed to accommodate the new rules. There was originally a district wide group which has been reconvened to come up with the process. There was discussion of who should take the lead, the College or the District.

d. Resource Allocation Council
Have not met.

e. Facilities Council
Have not met.

f. Senate Report
R. Stevenson reported that they are working on choosing discipline specialists for FSAs. A process is being developed for faculty who have not taught in a particular area. Accreditation and Program Review is also being discussed. Mike Smedshammer presented online teaching documents which will be further discussed at the next Senate meeting.

g. Student Report
The ASMJC Senate met and welcomed guest James Todd. Students will attend the March in March, and they are still looking for faculty or staff advisors. They will stress writing good policy into the budget. Students are gearing up for elections and will be training the newly elected officers.

h. Staff Report
P. Wallace reported that CSEA met this week. She explained that they do not discuss issues like the Academic Senate and ASMJC do. Nominees to the CSEA convention will be made at the next meeting. Policy and procedures are
discussed at the meetings and the CSEA rep on Policy and Procedure sends policy changes to the classified staff. She asked if reporting/discussion of policy changes was redundant. Susan answered that by discussing it at the councils a college-wide, rather than just a constituent lens, is used. It may be something that can be visited later.

VII. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:13

Next meeting: March 12, 2013, Yosemite 213, 3:30 – 5 p.m.
Instruction Council

Members: Mike Adams, Mark Anglin, Jeff Beebe, Lorena Dorn, Eric Fischer, Julie Hughes, Kimberly Kennard, Eileen Kerr, Susan Kincade (Chair), Deborah Lafffranchini, Mike Morales, Jeff Netto, Brian Sanders, Rob Stevenson (Co-Chair), Michael Sundquists, James Varble (ASMJC), Francisco Villasenor (ASMC), Pat Wallace

AGENDA
March 12, 2013
Yosemite 213, 3:30 – 5 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Approval of Agenda
   b. Approval of Minutes

III. CONTINUING BUSINESS
   a. Program Review
   b. Introduction to Guiding Principles – Discuss/Report

IV. NEW BUSINESS
   a. TMC Updates

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   None

VI. COUNCIL AND CONSTITUENCY UPDATES
   a. College Council
   b. Accreditation Council
   c. Student Services Council
   d. Resource Allocation Council
   e. Facilities Council
   f. Academic Senate Report
   g. Student Report
   h. Classified Staff Report

VII. ADJOURNMENT
I. Call to Order
R. Stevenson called the meeting to order at 3:34.

II. Action Items
   a. Approval of Agenda
      M. Adams moved and J. Beebe seconded the approval of the agenda. The agenda was unanimously approved.

   b. Approval of Minutes
      S. Kincade moved and J. Netto seconded a motion to approve the minutes of February 26. During discussion, M. Adams suggested changes clarifying the
description of how faculty hiring priorities were determined in the past. The minutes were accepted unanimous as modified by M. Adams.

III. Continuing Business

a. Program Review

S. Kincade reported that the Program Review process will not change for this year. A pilot is being conducted to begin the cyclical process of doing Program Review. B. Sanders asked for clarification that we are doing unit reviews of each program, certificate and degree offered. Areas are being asked to identify what they do and self-assess. Program reviews should be done from a student perspective and used to determine what works best for the student. J. Netto asked about the study session for Program Review to be conducted by Academic Senate. R. Stevenson reported that he had taken the request to the Senate and they hope to meet in early April. R. Stevenson, D. Laffranchini, John Zamora, James Todd, Jennifer Hamilton and Brian Sinclair are some of the members of the study group. The group is waiting for a new Program Review Liaison, who should be part of this study session. Over the summer, Academic Senate, Outcomes Assessment Workgroup and Instruction Office staff will meet to review the PLO process to see what is being done well and what improvements can be made. Program Reviews are due at the end of May.

b. Introduction to Guiding Principles – Discuss/Report

M. Adams and J. Netto distributed copies of a draft of Guiding Principles. R. Stevenson clarified that this is not to be considered a first reading of the document.

Several comments were given:

B. Sanders suggested that Item 4: should include, “Needs to align with the needs of the students while also addressing the standards and requirements of external requirements.”

D. Laffranchini recommended that until the councils are completely familiar with their charge, charges should be read at the beginning of each meeting. While developing the Guiding Principles, she suggested laying the charge side by side with the Guiding Principles to ensure that the charge is contained within them. R. Stevenson will include the Charge with the Principles the next time they are reviewed.

S. Kincade asked to swap out Items 5 and 3. There was discussion of whether it should be swapped or not. It was agreed to change the order to: 1, 5, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7.

Susan also suggested adding an Item f) External Regulatory Agencies and g) Community Stakeholders to Item 5.
B. Sanders and D. Laffranchini raised concerns about the term “relies primarily” in Item 2. There was discussion of whether it should remain as stated or if it should be revised.

S. Kincade suggested adding qualitative and quantitative before data in Item 6. B. Sanders asked that the terms be less vague. There was also a suggestion to change the terminology to describe how the data informs the recommendations.

R. Stevenson added that if additional ideas come to folks forward them to Mike and Jeff.

IV. New Business
   a. TMC Updates
      R. Stevenson gave an update. TMCs are designed to provide greater opportunity to transfer from California Community Colleges into California Universities. Math and Communication Studies were our first two TMCs approved in 2011. Administration of Justice, Business Administration, Music, Studio Art and Art History have since been approved at MJC. Kinesiology and Theater Arts currently are awaiting final approval at the state. Two have passed our local Curriculum Committee: Anthropology is going to the board of Trustees and Geology going to the state Chancellor’s Office. TMCs are a part of the Student Transfer Achievement Reform (STAR Act). There is a template faculty have been asked to complete asking whether or not similar programs are offered on campus. Eighty percent of our programs must be approved by summer 2013 and 100% by fall 2014. Philosophy just learned that theirs has been approved. S. Kerr recommended that everyone attend Barbara Adams workshops as they are informative and really help to prepare one for submitting their courses for TMC.

V. Informational Items
   None.

VI. COUNCIL AND CONSTITUENCY UPDATES
   R. Stevenson reminded the group that reports do not have to be comprehensive.
   a. College Council
      No report.
   b. Accreditation Council
      S. Kincade reported that the Accreditation Council did not meet due to the fact they are compiling information for the Annual Report due to the ACCJC on March 31, 2013.
   c. Student Services Council
      No report.
   d. Resource Allocation Council
      No report.
   e. Facilities Council
      Will not meet until March 18.
   f. Academic Senate Report
R. Stevenson reported they had an interesting discussion. James Todd rebuilt
the agenda so that council reports are at the beginning. James then asked if the
reps felt they were meeting their charge. Program Review was discussed.

**g. Student Report**
F. Villasenor reported that the Student Senate met on Friday. There was no
legislative report. Jennifer Hamilton attended the meeting and asked to restore
relations with the ASMJC. He is glad to be a part of the Instruction Council.

**h. Classified Staff Report**
J. Hughes reported that CSEA meets next week.

**VII. Comments From the Public**
S. Kincade commented that the Educational Master Plan will be added to the March
26 agenda. She asked for volunteers to assist in the development of the EMP. She
asked members to consider what the EMP should look like and what MJC should
look like in 5 years, 10 years, etc.? A copy of the EMP will be sent to council
members. B. Sanders wanted to know the hierarchy when looking at the
Educational Master Plans, Facilities Master Plan, etc. Susan will bring a visual
depiction. She added that a five year cycle is often followed.

**Action Item:**
Who: S. Kincade
What: Add Educational Master Plan to 3/26 agenda

**Action Item:**
Who: S. Kincade
What: Provide depiction of hierarchy of EMP, FMP, etc.

**Action Item:**
Who: Council Members
What: Consider serving on EMP workgroup

S. Kincade also reported that she, President Stearns, Susan Clifford and Jack Pond
met via telephone. MJC will respond to all ACCJC recommendations. The ACCJC
agreed to send a new team to the campus. Susan described the process gone
through by visiting teams.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**
The meeting adjourned at 4:43.

**Next meeting:** March 26, 2013, Yosemite 213, 3:30 – 5 p.m.
Instruction Council

Members: Mike Adams, Mark Anglin, Jeff Beebe, Lorena Dorn, Eric Fischer, Julie Hughes, Kimberly Kennard, Eileen Kerr, Susan Kincade (Chair), Deborah Laffranchini, Mike Morales, Jeff Netto, Brian Sanders, Rob Stevenson (Co-Chair), Michael Sundquist, James Varble (ASMJC), Francisco Villasenor (ASMC), Pat Wallace

AGENDA
March 26, 2013
Yosemite 213, 3:30 – 5 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ACTION ITEMS
a. Approval of Agenda
b. Approval of Minutes

III. CONTINUING BUSINESS
a. Introduction to Guiding Principles – 1st Reading

IV. NEW BUSINESS
a. Educational Master Plan – Discussion/Report
b. Distance Education: Course Review Flowchart – First Reading
c. Distance Education Online Course Design Rubric – First Reading

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
None

VI. COUNCIL AND CONSTITUENCY UPDATES
a. College Council
b. Accreditation Council
c. Student Services Council
d. Resource Allocation Council
e. Facilities Council
f. Academic Senate Report
g. Student Report
h. Classified Staff Report
i. Other College Business

VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

VII. ADJOURNMENT
I. Call to Order
   The meeting was called to order at 3:39.

II. Action Items
   a. Approval of Agenda
      R. Stevenson moved to table Distance Education: Course Review Flowchart – First Reading and Distance Education Online Course Design Rubric – First Reading under New Business to allow the Distance Education Advisory Committee additional time to refine the documents before bringing them to this body. J. Beebe seconded the motion. Agenda unanimously approved with suggested changes.
b. Approval of Minutes
R. Stevenson moved and M. Sundquist seconded a motion to approve the minutes of March 12. Minutes unanimously approved as submitted.

III. Continuing Business
a. Introduction to Guiding Principles – 1st Reading
M. Adams distributed a draft of the Guiding Principles with suggested edits from last meeting incorporated. He asked that the council review the draft and note any other changes. The Instruction Council charge and responsibilities from the Engaging all Voices: MJC Participatory Governance Decision-Making Handbook were included at the beginning of the document before beginning to enumerate the guiding principles.

R. Stevenson moved to approve the Guiding Principles. M. Adams seconded. There was discussion and edits were made. M. Anglin, Dean of Agriculture, demonstrated great skill in pruning the dead wood, providing room for the document to grow and flourish. There was discussion that the Instruction Council Guiding Principles should not override the work of other councils or committees. Guiding Principles were unanimously approved with noted edits. The document will be brought back to the April 9 meeting for a second reading.

Action Item:
Who: R. Stevenson and M. Adams
What: Moved/Seconded/Unanimous approval

Action Item:
Who: S. Kincade and R. Stevenson
What: Add Guiding Principles to April 9 agenda

IV. New Business
a. Educational Master Plan – Discussion/Report
  Tabled until next meeting.

b. Distance Education: Course Review Flowchart – First Reading
  Tabled until DEAC has completed their work.

c. Distance Education Online Course Design Rubric – First Reading
  Tabled until DEAC has completed their work.

V. Informational Items
None.

VI. Council and Constituency Updates
a. College Council
D. Laffranchini reported that there will be a first reading of Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory Governance Decision-Making Handbook document and looking at the effectiveness of the charges, responsibilities and participant structure of each council.
MJC will continue to focus on student success and how Prop 30 dollars will be spent. The matriculation processes will change. Replacement faculty will be hired. Assessment Day is April 13th.

b. Accreditation Council
S. Kincade reported that the Accreditation Council meets this Thursday, March 28.

c. Student Services Council
L. Dorn reported that there is a new task force working on priority registration. They are talking about the areas where MJC has some local control and that those decisions will be focused on helping students move through their programs.

d. Resource Allocation Council
No representative.

e. Facilities Council
M. Anglin reported there were updates on Measure E projects. ADA issues were discussed at length. Whether or not to secure the tables to the floor in the Fireside Lounge was discussed, and will be brought back to the next meeting. Students are in favor of securing the tables.

f. Academic Senate Report
R. Stevenson reported that the senate appointed faculty to serve on the FSA Discipline Faculty Specialist Committee. Curtis Martin was approved and has agreed to serve as the Faculty Liaison for Program Review. Board Policy 7849 passed its first reading.

g. Student Report
F. Villasenor invited council members to attend the Harvest of Empire documentary chronicling the US involvement in Central America. The film will be shown in Forum 110 on Friday, April 12 at 7 p.m.

h. Classified Staff Report
P. Wallace reported that CSEA met and appointed Julie Hughes as the web master for the CSEA, Chapter 420 website. Lue Martin was appointed as the Pre-Retirement Liaison. Delegates were nominated to go to conference.

i. Other College Business
S. Kincade apologized for not providing information on the Educational Master Plan. With Curtis Martin’s recent agreement to serve as the Faculty Liaison for Program Review, she decided to table the EMP discussion in order to begin discussions on Program Review Process Development. M. Morales asked that if we are looking at models from other colleges that we do our due diligence and ensure that what we adopt is a good process and not adopt one modeled after a school on sanction. R. Stevenson added that in our charge it states we will ensure that EMP is integrated into college planning processes. He suggested that we go back to College Council and ask if it is our charge to update the EMP and receive that direction from College Council.

April 22 we are to report back to college council the effectiveness of our charge. Susan asked the council members to review the charge. She showed the council
where to locate the Instruction Council website. Review of Instruction Council Charge will be added to the April 9 agenda. In addition, we will discuss **meeting our charge**.

**Action Item:**

- **Who:** S. Kincade and R. Stevenson
- **What:** Add Review of Instruction Council Charge to April 9 agenda
- **What:** Add Meeting the Instruction Council Charge to April 9 agenda
- **What:** Clarify the Instruction Council’s charge to ensure that the EMP is integrated into college planning processes.

B. Sanders asked about **advertising our summer offerings**. S. Kincade responded that this body will not oversee advertising. The College's Graphic Artists will be asked to develop marketing materials. S. Kincade reported that there will be an invitation going out for **website focus groups** to be held the second week in April. Student focus groups will be held this week.

S. Kincade shared that she participated in an **Accreditation Site Visit to Coastline Community College** last week. They have had Program Review in place since 1987, but Learning Outcomes are an issue even for them. As an example of one of the things she learned that will help MJC with future site visits she shared the importance of having evidence readily available and easily identifiable for external visitors. She added that going on a site visit helps one to learn how develop our documents that make it easier for outsiders to find our information.

S. Kincade will send **links to the Educational Master Plan**, adding that M. Sundquist, M. Anglin and B. Sanders have a lot of planning experience.

**Action Item:**

- **Who:** S. Kincade
- **What:** Send link to Educational Master Plan to council members

S. Kincade will be gone next week to the CIO Conference.

**VII. Open Comments from the Public**

None.

**VIII. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:57.

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, April 9, 2013, 3:30 – 5 p.m., Yosemite 213