

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.

Action Item

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.

Business

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 rified 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

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.