1. Introductions

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Action and Discussion Items
   a. Council Charge
   b. Rules and Procedures
   c. Board Policy Review and Comment
      Policy #3310 – Records Retention and Destruction
      Policy #7232 – Classification Review

4. New Business

5. Public Comments

6. Announcements

7. Adjournment
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 √
Lorena Dorn, Dean of Counseling and Student Services Dean √
Eric Fischer, Professor-Water Polo Coach Academic Senate √
Julie Hughes, Admission & Records Specialist CSEA √
Kimberly Kennard, Professor-Human Services Academic Senate √
Eileen Kerr, Professor-History YFA √
Deborah Laffrenchini, Professor-Child Development/Family Life Academic Senate √
Mike Morales, Professor-Plant Science Academic Senate √
Jeff Netto, Professor – English Academic Senate √
Brian Sanders, Dean of Science, Math & Engineering Dean √
Michael Sundquist, Dean of Arts, Humanities & Communication LTAC √
James Varble, Student ASMJC √
Francisco Villasenor, Student ASMJC √
Pat Wallace, Instruction Office Specialist CSAC √
CSEA Rep (Vacant) CSEA √
Amy Bethel, Executive Secretary, Instruction Office Recorder √

SUBSTITUTE
Name Member Substituting for
None

Business

1. Introductions
   Around the room introductions were made. All were present with the exception of one CSEA Representative who is yet to be identified.

2. Approval of Agenda
   J. Varble moved and M. Adams seconded a motion to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.
3. Council Charge
   a. Official Charge
R. Stevenson read aloud the official Charge and Responsibilities of the Instruction Council and the membership makeup from the document Engaging All Voices: MJC Participatory Governance Handbook.

S. Kincade added that she and Rob want to come from a positive position and should not assume that this will be a contentious group. She stated that all voices will be honored; whether they are the people who readily speak up or the ones who are slower to speak up. Members are expected to listen to others and can expect to be heard as well.

J. Varble shared that at College Council, Mr. Cripe presented a Guiding Principles document that was developed and will be used by the Resource Allocation Council. James suggested that we also develop guiding principles for this group. Susan commented that when she saw the document that she had already hoped to borrow the idea for this group.

R. Stevenson and B. Sanders expressed their excitement at being a part of this group.

R. Stevenson shared that this group will have to work closely with the other councils to ensure that we are not doing duplicate work and that we are in agreement with newly developed processes. Rob referred to this term as Term 0 as we are coming into the middle of so many processes. This will be our time to determine how to do what we need to do to achieve our charge. In April we will come back together to see what did not work and make adjustments. We will be looking at how the different groups work together. Susan stated that as representatives of constituency groups that it is the responsibility of each member of the Council to report out to their constituency groups what has occurred at the meetings and to bring forward the thoughts of their constituencies.

There was discussion of how Program Review will be handled in the future. It was decided to add Program Review Process to a future agenda. Guiding statements and timelines will be discussed. In the meantime, Susan and B. Sanders will meet to determine what to do for the current, upcoming Program Review. L. Dorn asked that it be kept in mind that not all Program Reviews are instructional.

**Action Item:**
Who: S. Kincade/R. Stevenson
What: Add Guiding Principles to future agenda

**Action Item:**
Who: S. Kincade/R. Stevenson
What: Add Program Review to future agenda
b. Rules and Procedures
Where possible, R. Stevenson encouraged open and thorough discussion. Where needed, motions would be made and votes taken, but he hopes to see the group work more toward consensus. When required, first and second readings of documents would be included on agendas.

There was discussion of how to run meetings. Quorum was defined as: 50% plus one of the currently assigned seats and 3 of the 4 representative groups present and respectful common sense.
There was additional discussion about how to address constituency-based issues if the affected area’s representative was not present. It was generally agreed that in such a circumstance, items could be tabled until such time as those representatives could be present. Respect and common sense would guide the council.

B. Sanders suggested Action Items appear on the minutes, with due dates and assignments as well as decided directions.

There was discussion of the report out structure. Faculty who are the reps for their divisions should report out to their division faculty as well as the Academic Senate. The deans will report to both the Deans’ Cabinet and their divisions. The deans not on the Instruction Council will take back the reports from the Deans’ Cabinet to their divisions. Staff and students will report back to their constituency groups as well. The council is transparent. It is ok to talk about what goes on at IC meetings.

c. Board Policy Review and Comment
Policy #3310 – Records Retention and Destruction
Policy #7232 – Classification Review
It was decided by the President that the college needs review Board Policy changes for a full vetting. Some policies are out of date and we are trying to bring our policies in line (including numbering structure) with the CCLC. The Instruction Council will have the opportunity to review policies and make recommendations to the College Council. R. Stevenson suggested that concerns be brought forward early so conversations can take place. Procedures are left to the College/District to develop. From College Council, policies go to District Council and then to the Board of Trustees for a first and second reading.

There were several questions raised and S. Kincade will research the answers. (See Action Item below)

It was noted that this item was not identified on the agenda as a first reading. According to the Brown Act, it should have been. It will reappear on the February 12 agenda as a first reading.
In the meantime, council members were asked to read the policy changes. A. Bethel will send electronic copies to the group for the next meeting.

**Action Item:**
Who: S. Kincade/R. Stevenson  
What: Add Board Policy Review and Comment, First Reading to February 12 agenda

**Action Item:**
Who: S. Kincade  
What: Find answers to:  
- Policy 3310-What are Class 3 – Disposable records?  
- What are “maps”?  
- Where should rollbooks be held?  
- How does the new numbering system work?

**Action Item:**
Who: A. Bethel  
What: Send electronic copies of the draft policies for first readings

4. **New Business**  
**College Council Representative**  
The Instruction Council will need to select a representative to serve on the College Council. A volunteer was sought to attend the next. Debbie Laffranchini volunteered to attend February 11 meeting as an interim. The topic will be added to the February 12 agenda and the selection process discussed.

**Action Item:**
Who: S. Kincade/R. Stevenson  
What: Add College Council Representative to February 12 agenda

5. **Public Comments**  
None

6. **Announcements**  
None

7. **Adjournment**  
Meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

**Next meeting:** February 12, 3:30 – 5 p.m., Yosemite 213
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
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 | ✓ | 
Lorena Dorn, Dean of Counseling and Student Services | Dean | ✓ | 
Eric Fischer, Professor-Water Polo Coach | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Julie Hughes, Admission & Records Specialist | CSEA | ✓ | 
Kimberly Kennard, Professor-Human Services | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Eileen Kerr, Professor-History | YFA | ✓ | 
Deborah Laffranchini, Professor-Child Development/Family Life | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Mike Morales, Professor-Plant Science | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Jeff Netto, Professor – English | Academic Senate | ✓ | 
Brian Sanders, Dean of Science, Math & Engineering | Dean | ✓ | 
Michael Sundquist, Dean of Arts, Humanities & Communication | LTAC | ✓ | 
James Varble, Student | ASMJC | ✓ | 
Francisco Villasenor, Student | ASMJC | ✓ | 
Pat Wallace, Instruction Office Specialist | CSAC & Recorder for this meeting | ✓ | 
CSEA Rep (Vacant) | CSEA | ✓ | 
Amy Bethel, Executive Secretary, Instruction Office | Recorder | ✓ | 

*SUBSTITUTE*

Name | Member Substituting for
---|---
None | 

*GUESTS*

Name | Representing
---|---
James Todd | Chair of Outcomes Assessment Work Group & Academic Senate President

*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 bottlenecks? 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 pilot 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

- **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
Modesto Junior College
Instruction Council
February 26, 2013

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 | √ |
Lorena Dorn, Dean of Counseling and Student Services | Dean | √ |
Eric Fischer, Professor-Water Polo Coach | Academic Senate | √ |
Julie Hughes, Admission & Records Specialist | CSEA | √ |
Kimberly Kennard, Professor-Human Services | Academic Senate | √ |
Eileen Kerr, Professor-History | YFA | √ |
Deborah Laffranchini, Professor-Child Development/Family Life | Academic Senate | √ |
Mike Morales, Professor-Plant Science | Academic Senate | √ |
Jeff Netto, Professor – English | Academic Senate | √ |
Brian Sanders, Dean of Science, Math & Engineering | Dean | √ |
Michael Sundquist, Dean of Arts, Humanities & Communication | LTAC | √ |
James Varble, Student | ASMJC | √ |
Francisco Villasenor, Student | ASMJC | √ |
Pat Wallace, Instruction Office Specialist | CSEA | √ |
CSAC Rep (Vacant) | CSAC | √ |
Amy Bethel, Executive Secretary, Instruction Office | Recorder | √ |

SUBSTITUTE

Name | Member Substituting for
---|---
None | |

GUEST

Name | 
---|---
Debi Bolter | Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair

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. Laffranchini 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
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 Laffranchini, Mike Morales, Jeff Netto, Brian Sanders, Rob Stevenson (Co-Chair), Michael Sundquist, 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.

**Business**

**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
Instruction Council

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

AGENDA
April 9, 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 – 2nd Reading

IV. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Instructional Council Charge
   b. Hiring Prioritization
   c. Educational Master Plan – Discussion/Report

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

R. Stevenson called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.
II. Action Items
   a. Approval of Agenda
      M. Adams moved and M. Morales seconded the motion to move Item b.-Hiring Prioritization under New Business to the beginning of the agenda in deference to the guests in attendance. The agenda was unanimously accepted with the noted change.

   b. Approval of Minutes
      P. Wallace asked to change the word selected to nominated in the CSEA Report. P. Wallace moved and J. Beebe seconded the motion to accept the minutes of March 26 with the noted change. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Continuing Business
   a. Introduction to Guiding Principles – 2nd Reading
      Tabled to April 23 meeting.

IV. New Business
   a. Instruction Council Charge
      Tabled to April 23 meeting.

   b. Hiring Prioritization
      The guests were welcomed and thanked for their attendance. R. Stevenson gave some history of how hiring prioritization had been determined in the past and explained that we currently do not have a working hiring procedure process. With the passage of Prop 30, we now have to borrow from 2013-14 year and even need to grow by 2%. It is an enviable situation, but causes a dire need for MJC to hire faculty to be able to meet those numbers. President Stearns, Susan Kincade, VPI and Brenda Thames, VPSS met with the Academic Senate to try to develop a process for hiring in quick order.
      The three different types of hires under consideration were described:
      1. Library full-time tenure track which is outside of this conversation due to commitment from MJC through Mary Retterer, former Interim President, to the ACCJC
      2. Three restoration (growth) positions selected by the deans chosen to produce FTES and alleviate student bottlenecks, minimize costs and generate FTES.
      3. The president had a concern about the number of retirements. The deans will be able to fill their retirements within their own areas. At the Academic Senate, James Todd, Academic Senate President, got two motions passed:
         1. Maintain FL 11C that was written in the wake of RIFs and programmatic cuts. It recommends that programs be reinstated with Program Viability or Program Review. The three areas affected were Art, Library and Intec. Art and Library have been
2. In order to integrate hiring with student demographics, participatory governance, etc. that the deans and the IC meet to discuss One-Year Temporary hires so that we can thoroughly plan for permanent full-time positions.

The deans were in attendance to be a part of the conversation. M. Sundquist reported that the deans had met previously and recommended that the One-Year Temporary hires would be in Math, Business Administration and Speech Communications/Forensics, with a further recommendation that if funding is available, a Medical Assisting faculty be hired. There was further discussion between the deans and the Instruction Council members.

R. Stevenson asked if it was felt there was consensus for approving the recommendation to submit the three/four positions as presented. If so, a motion would need to be made. S. Circle expressed a concern from the Lit & Lang division that in addition to retirements, they have experienced deaths of faculty members and resignations and retirements from past years. It was explained that all divisions have suffered attrition in their ranks and that as a way to begin to fill the gaps they had to look at the dollars available. It was decided to begin with the retirees from this year as a jumping off point because their salaries have already been included in next year’s budget.

There is a possibility that we can capture funding from other schools that cannot meet their FTES targets. There was discussion of why MJC’s FTE numbers are down. It was explained that Financial Aid rules changed, we instated the Pay 2 Stay program and the number of times a student can take a class for improvement of grade. Beginning in the fall, repeatability changes will also kick in.

D. Laffranchini moved and S. Kincade seconded a motion to approve the three restoration positions as a group unranked: Math, Business Administration and Speech Communications/Forensics and that a fourth be considered if funding becomes available (Medical Assisting). L. Dorn expressed concern that by including the fourth position, if funding became available, that other college positions might not be given the opportunity to be considered or that other college processes might be overstepped. Pedro talked about industry needs for Medical Assisting which was the driver for including it. There was discussion about whether or not to rank the “top” three.

M. Adams moved and M. Morales seconded an amendment to the motion to add after medical assisting: if funding becomes available after the three other positions are filled. There was discussion of the amendment. M. Anglin further stated that the change to the verbiage better describes the conversations and intent of the deans during their discussions. L. Dorn expressed concern that Counseling faculty are ranked outside of the process of developing new faculty hires. She would like to point out that the lens she is speaking from is that Counseling faculty are considered outside of the process for hiring classroom faculty. M. Anglin expressed agreement and an understanding of her position.
The full motion now read: **Approval to move forward with the three restoration positions as a group unranked: Math, Business Administration and Speech Communications and that Medical Assisting be filled if money is available after filling the first three.** The amended motion passed unanimously.

M. Morales asked for a point of clarification that if after the May revise, we have less money, would we be able to meet our FTE obligation? The answer is yes, and as the positions are temporary, we could easily adjust if necessary.

The conversation continued with discussion of replacement for retirements:

B. Sanders moved and P. Wallace seconded the following motion: **This body recommends that if a retirement happens within the 2012-13 academic year that the division meet to prioritize the one-year temporary full-time hire of a replacement for 2013-14. Replacement positions must be looked at for assisting student achievement, FTES generation and minimized cost.**

There was further discussion of how the decisions would be made for rehires. P. Bettencourt asked what would be the last date the faculty could retire to still be able to rehire. S. Kincade added that S. Circle made a good point by mentioning that there are other losses of faculty throughout the year that have not yet been addressed. Following discussion, **the motion passed unanimously.**

There was discussion as to how the three criteria might affect the decision of which position to rehire. C. Hudelson asked about permanent replacement v. the one-year temporary replacement. R. Stevenson reminded the group that what the Academic Senate agreed to was the one-year temporary position. C. Hudelson expressed concern that by doing the one-year temporary position, that there was the possibility that she could (or any other division) could lose their position. Rob explained that this could be a possibility, but in the absence of a hiring policy, that this is the best solution that could be arrived at in the short term.

C. Hudelson noted that at College Council it was agreed to work over the summer to research some possibilities to bring information back to the councils

B. Sanders moved and E. Kerr seconded the following motion: **This body would strongly urge that all councils and constituent groups meet to create the faculty hiring prioritization procedures expeditiously in order for us to advertise our full-time tenure track positions by the end of the fall semester.** There was no discussion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

c. **Educational Master Plan – Discussion/Report**

Tabled to April 23 meeting.

V. Informational Items

None
VI. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS
   Tabled to April 23 meeting.
   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
   None

   Due to the length of discussion of Hiring Priorities, S. Kincade moved to table all other
   agenda items. S. Circle seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
   The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Next meeting:  Tuesday, April 23, 2013, Yosemite 213, 3:30 – 5 p.m.
Instruction Council

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

AGENDA
April 23, 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 – 2nd Reading

IV. NEW BUSINESS
a. Instruction Council Charge
b. Instruction Council Self-Evaluation
c. Educational Master Plan – Discussion/Report
d. Distance Education: Course Review Flowchart – First Reading
e. 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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
I. Call to Order
   S. Kincade called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

II. Action Items
   a. Approval of Agenda
      D. Laffranchini moved and R. Stevenson seconded a motion to approve the agenda as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

   b. Approval of Minutes
R. Stevenson moved and E. Kerr seconded a motion to accept the minutes of April 9 as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Continuing Business
   a. Introduction to Guiding Principles – 2nd Reading
      The document was displayed on the white board and copies were distributed. M. Adams read the document aloud. S. Circle commented that she really liked a former version of Item 6 of the document that included analysis of data in the principle. After discussion, it was decided to leave Item 6 as it appears in this current version of the document.

      B. Sanders asked if Item 4 needed to include verbiage about the District’s strategic plan. No change was made to include it. Item4a. was revised to include “and planning documents.”

      M. Anglin asked for a revision to the first sentence in Item 1 to delete “positive and negative.”

      S. Circle moved to accept the Guiding Principles as amended. R. Stevenson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. New Business
   a. Instruction Council Charge
   b. Instruction Council Self-Evaluation
      S. Kincade included the IC charge and self-evaluation from College Council into the agenda item. Suggested changes and discussion included:

      • Inclusion of a rep from the Distance Ed Committee was requested. It was determined that it would be beneficial to have a person on IC that could also report back to the Distance Ed Committee. L. Dorn lent her support to the suggestion adding that when the Distance Education Committee discusses items not relevant to the Instruction Council that they should be able to take those issues to the appropriate council.

      • M. Adams questioned whether or not budget development should be included in the IC Charge. Changes to the verbiage were discussed and it was decided to specify that it is “instructional” budget development in both the charge and responsibilities.

      • B. Sanders suggested an edit to change the term “Education Master Plan” to read “Educational Master Plan.” He also suggested changing “Enrollment Management” to read “Oversee Enrollment Management.”

      • E. Kerr raised the issue of information flow; how we report what we do and who do we report to. A meeting should be dedicated to how this will work and then drill down on how each topic will be dealt with, i.e., Program
B. Sanders asked if we should add something specific to Distance Education. S. Kincade added that maybe we should add a statement clarifying what committees could benefit from reporting to or out of IC. B. Sanders suggested that perhaps there should be a flowchart or relationship chart showing the councils and how they work together to report out or receive reports from each other. It was determined that the College Council would be the one to develop the large chart, but the other councils and committees should also develop their own relationship chart showing who they report to and who should report to them. S. Circle recalled that there was a chart that B. Sanders developed last summer before the governance structure was changed. It is currently posted, but should not receive wide dissemination until it is updated. It was recommended to include information in the Engaging All Voices document to describe how the councils work together and how information flows.

- B. Sanders noted that the IC discussed faculty hiring, but asked if instructional support positions will be discussed in IC as well. S. Kincade noted that it should be here as well as other councils.

- Do not separate Distance Ed out as its own bullet, but fold it in with other instructional discussions. E. Kerr asked if we are a directive body or a recommending body to DE. S. Kincade stated that she would like to stay away from the word directive, but rather one that makes recommendations or suggestions.

- S. Circle asked if Program Viability was a function of YFA. There was discussion and it was determined that it is a function of the Academic Senate. R. Stevenson noted that a document had been developed making it a process that can be started by the division or by the Academic Senate either one working with the Instruction Council. There were no suggestions for changes to Program Viability.

No vote was taken on any of the above suggestions. S. Kincade will send a copy of the list out to the council members when forwarding it to the President’s Office.

R. Stevenson noted that there are many things that we cannot do online, but until there is an action item, discussions regarding agenda building could begin via email over the summer. Those discussions will come back to the full IC early in the fall when we return after summer break.

**Action Item:**

- **Who:** R. Stevenson and S. Kincade
- **What:** Share proposed suggestions for changes to the charge and responsibilities of IC based on discussion bulleted above with the college president
c. Educational Master Plan – Discussion Report
J. Todd, S. Kincade and R. Stevenson have talked about the fact that the EMP will be a hot topic for the Accreditation Visiting Team in the fall. It is understood that we will not have it completed by the time the team arrives. James has volunteered to try to gather a body of faculty who may want to work on it over the summer in concert with members of the IC. S. Circle wondered if we needed such a huge document going into so much detail about programs and wondered why those could not be discussed in Program Review rather than the EMP. It will be the charge of such a group to look at EMPs from other institutions. B. Sanders asked for clarity between the EMP, Strategic Plan, Mission, Values and Goals. S. Kincade said that there is information on the ACCJC website and CCCCIO website. She will gather the information. D. Laffranchini, M. Adams, S. Circle and E. Kerr volunteered to look at some models over the summer. S. Kincade will recruit some administrators to assist as well.

Action Item:
Who:  S. Kincade
What: Share information describing the difference between EMP, Strategic Plan, Mission, Values and Goals with the IC

Action Item:
Who:  S. Kincade
What: Recruit administrators to begin developing the EMP

Action Item:
Who:  M. Adams, S. Circle, E. Kerr and D. Laffranchini
What: Begin investigating EMPs at other institutions over the summer

d. Distance Education: Course Review Flowchart – First Reading

e. Distance Education Online Course Design Rubric – First Reading
R. Stevenson moved and M. Sundquist seconded a motion to accept the Course Review Flowchart and Online Course Design Rubric as submitted by the Distance Ed Committee. R. Stevenson reported that Mike Smedshammer attended the Academic Senate meeting to introduce the
Flowchart and Design Rubric. After allaying concerns that this would be a second evaluation tool for deans to use outside of the YFA evaluation process, and explaining that the documents are a self-evaluation tool that would help to guide new online faculty as they begin to develop their online courses, the Senate was comfortable with the document. E. Kerr asked if the intent was that the faculty member would meet with the Dean prior to the course actually being offered. S. Kincade answered that is correct. S. Circle asked if a tenured faculty member would have their online course evaluated even if they have been teaching face-to-face. It was explained that the process will be evaluated, but it is a self-evaluation. R. Stevenson added that at other schools, there is a course designer and support for the courses. We do not have that. S. Kincade shared some horror stories. B. Sanders asked for a best practices document from Academic Senate. R. Stevenson stated that the Academic Senate has created and approved best practices for syllabi development. He will locate a copy and forward it to the council. There was discussion that a template be developed that could be used if the faculty member chose to do so.

There was discussion that at some point perhaps there be a crosswalk to make sure that they match. M. Morales raised an issue of ADA compliance.

R. Stevenson recommended that each council member take the documents back to their constituency groups and ask for feedback and that M. Smedshammer be invited to the next council meeting.

Following discussion, the motion to accept the documents carried unanimously.

**Action Item:**
- **Who:** R. Stevenson
- **What:** Located and forward a copy of the best practices for developing syllabi to the IC

**Action Item:**
- **Who:** R. Stevenson and S. Kincade
- **What:** Invite Mike Smedshammer to the next IC meeting.

**Action Item:**
- **Who:** R. Stevenson and M. Sundquist
- **What:** Moved/Seconded a motion to accept the Course Review Flowchart and Online Course Design Rubric as submitted by the Distance Ed Committee.

**V. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**
None.

**VI. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**
None.
VII. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC
None.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
M. Adams moved and R. Stevenson seconded the motion to adjourn. Motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

Next meeting: September 17, 2013, 3 – 5 p.m., Yosemite 213