Instruction Council

Members: Mike Adams, Mark Anglin, Jeff Beebe, Shelley Circle, Lorena Dorn, Kathleen Ennis, Eric Fischer, Rodrigo Gomez (ASMJC), Julie Hughes, Korey Keith (ASMJC), Kimberly Kennard, Susan Kincade (Chair), Deborah Laffranchini, Mike Morales, Brian Sanders, Al Smith, Rob Stevenson (Co-Chair), Michael Sundquist, Pat Wallace

AGENDA
April 22, 2014
Yosemite 213, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

III. CONTINUING BUSINESS
   a. Faculty Hiring Prioritization – Process Review: Workgroup Update
   b. Instruction Council Annual Evaluation

IV. NEW BUSINESS

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   Student Success and Support Plan and Equity Plan

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. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
Modesto Junior College
Instruction Council
April 22, 2014

Members | Representing | Present | Absent
--- | --- | --- | ---
Susan Kincade, Vice President of Instruction | Chair | ✓ | 
Rob Stevenson, Professor-Art | Co-Chair/Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Michael Adams, Professor-Math | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Mark Anglin, Dean of Agriculture & Environmental Sciences | Dean | ✓ | 
Jeff Beebe, Professor-Automotive Technology | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Shelley Circle, Professor – English | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Lorena Dorn, Dean of Counseling and Student Services | Dean | ✓ | 
Kathleen Ennis, Professor – Librarian | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Eric Fischer, Professor-Water Polo Coach | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Rodrigo Gomez, Student | ASMJC | ✓ | 
Julie Hughes, Admission & Records Specialist | CSAC | ✓ | 
Korey Keith, Student | ASMJC | ✓ | 
Kimberly Kennard, Professor-Human Services | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Deborah Laffranchini, Professor-Child Development/Family Life | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Mike Morales, Professor-Plant Science | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Brian Sanders, Dean of Science, Math & Engineering | Dean | ✓ | 
Al Smith, Professor – History | YFA | ✓ | 
Michael Sundquist, Dean of Arts, Humanities & Communication | LTAC | ✓ | 
Pat Wallace, Instruction Office Specialist | CSEA | ✓ | 
Amy Bethel, Executive Secretary, Instruction Office | Recorder | ✓ | 

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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Beach, Administrative Secretary (Recorder)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Call to Order

R. Stevenson called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. Action Items

a. Approval of Agenda

S. Circle moved to approve the agenda.
Seconded by J. Beebe.
Result: Unanimously approved.

b. Approval of Minutes
Action Item:
S. Kincade moved to approve the minutes.
Seconded by M. Adams.
Result: Unanimously approved.

Business

III. Continuing Business

a. Faculty Hiring Prioritization – Process Review: Workgroup Update
S. Circle, M. Adams, and B. Sanders met on 4/11/14 to review the Faculty Hiring Prioritization process. They shared the following ideas they felt were worth discussing:

- Add one more category
- Remove “Mandate” as a category
- How to ensure accuracy of and effectively use data to determine community need
- Revise the scoring rubric, but keep history, alignment with educational master plan, program review and staying in alignment with the direction of the college
- Remove data from the scoring rubric and make it part of the Outlook Report
- Non-Instructional positions may not rank as high when combined with instructional positions
- List a percentage of hires as “support areas,” to avoid competition between instructional and non-instructional positions
- Adding an area for “create” or “reinstate”

S. Circle asked members for direction and ideas regarding the workgroup’s suggestions.

S. Kincade stated in terms of data and accuracy that Paul Cripe referred to a formula that would be helpful to the IC. She suggested that he be invited to a future meeting to share the best practices and pitfalls.

M. Sundquist suggested that although we moved away from that idea, there should be a special track for non-instructional positions. He feels it’s hard for those positions competing with FTEs positions. There was discussion of the value of finding an appropriate percentage between instructional v. non-instructional positions. L. Dorn likes the idea of a certain ratio or an understanding that there needs to be instructional support, but doesn’t want to separate them. Discussion was held regarding FTES and Librarians vs. instructional and non-instructional positions.

R. Stevenson suggested they collect different data in a certain way. It is difficult to identify what data is needed. He supports taking “mandated” out of the general area. It could be appropriate for prioritizing a replacement position, but maybe less so than for growth. There was discussion of who supplies the data and how do we know we are looking at the same data elements as we go through the process. He added that he is intrigued by the idea of reinstatement.
as a type of growth, and questioned how you could show that a program should be reinstated.

There was further discussion of reinstating or creating new programs. S. Kincade cautioned that we need to keep an eye on where jobs are. Before we put something forward, data needs to show there will be a job where you invest in a hope. R. Stevenson said applying for a program or degree from the State is a 2-year process with developing curriculum, TOP Code, etc. which is different than reinstatement, if it is truly new.

D. Laffranchini added that she heard a news report discussing whether or not community colleges are out of touch with what’s happening in today’s world. We are not responsive job-wise, teaching old methods and ideas. S. Kincade shared that the VPs met with a leading local employer and learned that if we try to come forward with what we have now, it is not good enough to meet their needs. No employer has the time to wait. Businesses need to be able to partner with community colleges for fast effective training. In this instance, the business is hiring a position just to do the educational component. They were very blunt. They need to know when they hire someone that they have the capacity to learn. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the need for more private partnerships with faculty and students on the business site, providing training for entry-level employees and beyond.

D. Laffranchini asked for suggestions for a rubric, adding that Mike Smedshammer has great ideas for rubrics on his webpage. S. Kincade distributed a memo from President Stearns that was shared with College Council, describing the next steps in Faculty Hiring. R. Stevenson suggested we mobilize a small group and will send an email to get the next round of prioritization started. We most likely will not know how many to plan for until the May revise, but if too many are prioritized, if funding becomes available, there will be a list to refer to. We should begin with 3 growth, and possibly 5 replacements. Mandated positions need to be considered as do the effects that changes to repeatability might have on the needs of a program.

b. Instruction Council Annual Evaluation

R. Stevenson said he received no feedback from IC members. S. Kincade held a forum in the past that was effective and could be used as a model for a process. R. Stevenson investigated whether or not there was an Academic Senate timeline for the self-evaluation and could find nothing in writing. However, fall would be a good time for Senate to give feedback before engaging in conversations regarding hiring prioritization or changes to the Engaging all Voices document.

S. Kincade stated that the self-evaluation is an MJC College Council function and where we need to weigh in is under Instruction Council effectiveness. We can indicate the number of presentations we had or note the taking of the program review process and morphing into our own self-evaluation process.
S. Circle added that she would like to evaluate the types of conversations held, how they were conducted, processes developed, and how we would revise them. The primary areas of focus were creating the Guiding Principles, refining the Instruction Council Charge and developing and engaging in the Hiring Prioritization process. R. Stevenson agreed with this assessment and added that we need to look at our charge: where we connected; where we need to improve, and to set a timeline for next year; where do we want to see replacements, followed by growth; what did we accomplish; what do we need to do that we have not done and what can we improve on? Review of the Instruction Council Charge occurred that included the following comments:

- Ensure that the Educational Master Plan is integrated into the college process. Development will occur after the Strategic Master Plan is in place. This college-wide process will begin early fall.
- Maintain and implement Board Policy. We have had several documents come through for review and council approval: Accreditation Follow-Up Report, Mid-Term Report, and Substantive Change Report.
- Assure that instruction occurs as approved by the Curriculum Committee and that Outcomes Assessment is in compliance. We have a good process through OAW, but follow-up or reporting out to the IC is needed. A year-end OAW report used to be done annually.
- Enrollment management has been discussed and the need for doing so has been felt. Datatel issues are hindering progress in enrollment management. We can expect improvements soon which will help our efforts in doing meaningful enrollment management.
- Ensuring completion of Program Review for the purpose of resource allocation for meeting student and community needs is primarily done by RAC, but the IC upheld a large portion of this charge by completing faculty hiring prioritization. R. Stevenson noted that this year, the process was done without Program Review, however. There is a large part of this item that intersects with other entities.
- Discuss and respond to emerging needs of the institutions and the community. We deal with these issues as they come up. Student Equity Planning, 3SP and the Student Success Plan are areas where the IC could have been more engaged. We have made several recommendations with our own charge and hiring prioritization that affect the outcomes of these three initiatives, but only indirectly.
- Engage in institutional strategic planning and budget development– We will complete this in the future.
- Engage in self-evaluation of IC. We are on track to meet that goal, but still need to determine how to move forward with the results. We have supported our responsibilities to all constituent groups. We have done well; speaking robustly on quorum and exactly how we would deal with the types of items/matters that came to us. S. Kincade suggested looking at the rubric to decide on how to use the form. We need to finish our self-evaluation which will go to College Council for approval and we need further communication to achieve that. It was suggested that Faculty Hiring Prioritization be added under Responsibilities.
IV. New Business – Nothing to report

V. Informational Items
   a. Student Success and Support Plan and Student Equity Plan
      L. Dorn provided IC members with the Student Success Plan handout and stated James Todd invited individuals to meet and discuss this plan. The plan will be written in summer and is open to all interested parties. The focus will be on beginning steps for students who are at risk, undecided, basic skills needs, probation, etc. IC members received the Student Equity Plan by email with additional description on each section. The guiding principles are: Board Policy, Enrollment Management, and Engaging Budget Development. The Student Equity Plan will now have funding. It is supposed to be a 3-5 year plan but we will look at it annually. At a minimum, colleges review and address student populations.

      Success Indicators are access, course completion, ESL, Degree/Certificate/Transfer, etc. The data or success indicators are important to bring to IC. R. Stevenson asked if this document comes back to Instruction Council for vetting.

      Clarification of plan names was made: The 3SP Plan (Student Success & Support Plan) and Student Equity Plan.

Action Item:
R. Stevenson moved to recommend that Instruction Council endorse Lorena Dorn, Kathleen Ennis, Deborah Laffranchini and Al Smith to be on the Student Success and Support Program Plan and Student Equity Plan workgroup, create liaisons and bring work back to IC.
Seconded by A. Smith.
Result: Unanimously approved.

VI. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS
   a. College Council
      No report.

   b. Accreditation Council
      S. Kincade reported that the Accreditation Council did not meet since last IC meeting.

   c. Student Services Council
      L. Dorn stated the regular SSC meeting was replaced with a meeting to discuss 3SP.

   d. Resource Allocation Council
      We do not presently have a representative from this council.

   e. Facilities Council
      No report.
f. Senate Report
D. Laffranchini reported that there was a dialogue about the high unit math courses. There was a first reading of a Resolution. She felt it was a respectful conversation. There are strong feelings, several very disparate opinions and emotions are high. Next meeting may be more emotional as it will go to a vote. S. Circle stated that it was an informative meeting. S. Kincade added that she hopes that we get to a place where we can have conversations and do what is best for the college as a whole.
There was a second reading of the amended Bike Path Resolution.
A resolution from the Library in support of requesting a change in the placement of Accreditation standard 2c: Student Support & Library & Learning Support Services was read.
Discussion occurred regarding voting practices for President and Vice President of Senate.

g. Student Report
No report.

h. Staff Report
No report.

VII. OTHER

Faculty Hiring Prioritization process for 2014-15 was discussed. September 30 should be the deadline for retirements in order to make decisions on replacement and growth. Divisions should be notified of this deadline. Discussion will occur according to the following suggested timeline (timeline may be revised):

- Replacements – 1st November meeting
- Growth presentations – 2nd November meeting
- Totals & discussion – 3rd November meeting

It was suggested that the work group should meet over the summer as this is a tight timeline. The group agreed to meet before the next IC meeting and would invite Paul Cripe and Kevin Alavezos to be present.

M. Sundquist suggested having two more meetings to meet the proposed timeline for next year as we cannot get items to HR until January. Discussion ensued and many members were willing to meet over summer. Divisions are hard to reach regarding retirements; it is not easy to come up with retirement commitments. We would like to avoid the same issues as this year. It was suggested that in the future, possibly in the spring semester, divisions could begin discussions of growth positions. More time will be needed for replacements. It was asked what is fiscally possible. The IC process needs to be completed prior to the December College Council meetings.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
R. Stevenson announced that he would not be serving on Instruction Council next fall. He wished Amy Bethel were present as he wanted to thank her for her work and
expressed it was a wonderful working relationship. He thanked S. Kincade saying it was a pleasure co-chairing with her and a very easy working relationship. He thanked Council members for a wonderful two years! S. Kincade said she also enjoyed working with R. Stevenson as he was a great strength with his organization and positive outlook. R. Stevenson said he would encourage people to serve on IC and would contact James Todd in a timely fashion, as this has been a great experience!

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

2014-15 meeting schedule will be determined at a later date.