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MINUTES

Membership:
Administration
Roger Schultz - MVC
Becky Elam - SJC
Pat Schwerdtfeger - MVC
Bill Vincent - MVC

Faculty
John Seed - MVC
Lorraine Slattery-Farrell-SJC
Stacey Searl-Chapin - MVC
Evelyn Menz - SJC

Classified
Marcus Castellanos-MVC

Students
Lilliana Gomez

Support Staff
Rebecca Teague (MVC), Brandon Moore, Paul Hert (MVC), Brian Orlauski, Fred Frontino (SJC), Nik Mesaris, Jared Davis

1. Approval of Minutes of November 18, 2014 Meeting
m/sc Searl-Chapin/Slattery-Farrell
Moved to approve the minutes of November 18, 2014.
Motion passed. Bridge abstained.

2. Discussion/Information
a. Education Master Plan – Rebecca Teague
The current Ed MP is approved through 2016. Our intent is to have the new Ed MP ready to go by fall of 2016. We will start working on it this year doing as much as we can with the resources we have in-house. If we find we need to go out for additional assistance we can do that. Since the Ed MP is a much more comprehensive document it will take a full 18 months to deliver. The discussion will begin this spring.

Dr. Schultz – we believe we can do this in-house just as we did with the Strategic Plan. We have always found that the staff ends up doing a great deal of the work anyway so let’s not pay a consultant for something we can do ourselves. We aren’t opposed to bringing in help if we need it, but we can at least get started.
Rebecca said that the development will mimic the structure similar to what was used for the Strategic Plan. It will start with a small working group following a shared governance model of participants.

b. Program Review and Assessment Progress and Status Report – Paul Hert
We are in the first year of a 3-year program review cycle. The first year everyone writes a pretty large, comprehensive program review (CPR). Instruction and the faculty have finished and the Deans have their template and are working on that. The Student Services Deans have completed their unit plans. The administrative units are also working on their program reviews. We have very good participation, approximately 97% at this time.

Rebecca – there are a few groups that haven’t completed their reviews but meetings are being scheduled to assist those where needed. We need 100% compliance as we move into this cycle.

Dr. Pat – last year he and the Deans met with all of the disciplines and this year we will also go over this information at the IAPRC meeting so everyone can hear what is going on and what is needed in the different areas. We are discovering a lot of needs and concerns through this process. Some of them we can fix immediately and others we can work on as the resources become available.

Dr. Schultz – asked how this as evidence is being chronicled and how we can demonstrate it in the next accreditation.

Rebecca – we are outlining the meetings. There is no formal note taking but that can easily be fixed.

Dr. Schultz – would like evidence of the institutional dialogue that is pervasive throughout the campus. He would like it included in minutes for that use.

Rebecca – the faculty will receive communication from Paul or the Deans on the assessment schedules. They completed those schedules in the fall and they
identified when certain courses would be assessed. To make sure we are in the 3-year cycle we will be checking to make sure those assessments are being done.

Paul – part of the new requirements include each course being assessed twice every 3 years so any program of any size offering a number of classes is being assessed for something every semester. They then have six weeks into the next semester to write the course improvement plan. We have adequate participation from both the fulltime and associate faculty to get the data we need to write the reports. He is getting that data together now and sending it off to the participants so they can write the course improvement plans and we can document that on the college website so we have both the data and the reports.

Rebecca – asked Lorraine and Stacey how we should incorporate the Academic Senate’s involvement in encouraging the faculty for the schedules and to make sure we are doing the assessment. How are we going to show we have that connection with the Academic Senate and that it is a faculty driven process?

Lorraine – there is a place on the Executive Meeting agenda where Paul can speak and reports can be given to the Senate on the progress. That information will also be documented in the minutes and that will serve as the evidence you are looking to capture. Paul’s update can also be sent as a written report and that will be included in the minutes.

c. RAP Scoring Timeline – Becky Elam

The Board adopted the budget calendar and the RAP timelines were incorporated in the calendar. The budget information will be distributed after we receive the P-1. In March we will roll out the budget information to the divisions and the RAP timelines to the faculty and staff. The prioritized RAPs will be due to the business office March 20th. The PAR ad hoc committees will convene in April to score the RAPs. RAPs will be approved by budget and IPC committees by May. It is a tight timeline. These funded RAPs will be communicated and distributed in time for the new academic year. They will be posted on the website. Last year we didn’t have as many people volunteer to score the RAPs so we would ask that you encourage those in your area to volunteer this year.
Dr. Pat – the one area we need to improve deals with the positions. If we aren’t going to fund positions we need to make that clear up front. We don’t really have criteria on which to base that process so we need to talk about this and come up with something that will work and is clear to everyone.

Fred – asked about the rubric that was developed last year for classified.

Rebecca – when we really took a look at it we realized we can’t treat the classified like we do the faculty because there are too many factors that come into play. We weren’t ready to adopt that rubric. That is why we are stuck in this area. This is not an easy fix.

Lorraine – who made the decision to toss it without a discussion?

Dr. Schultz – we haven’t tossed it. We can revisit it and continue to try to refine it and come up with a working model. It is very difficult. We can put it back on the agenda for discussion in the future.

John – can we use the Joint Hiring model for classified? We could trust people to discuss it using that model.

Fred – will the model fit every case, probably not but it is a process and we can start with it and refine it.

Lorraine – would like to have that discussion in this committee.

Rebecca – we need a staffing plan that sets the minimal staffing levels across the district. It needs to take into account the difference sites, programs, structures because without that piece it won’t meet the established need that ACCJC has determined for us concerning the minimal levels.

Anna – is there potential for some kind of connection between submitting a RAP to meet a need that subsequently requires a new position to support that need?
Rebecca – no, not at this time. We can have that conversation for the next cycle.

Fred – The RAP/PAR has gone through several iterations and it seems to be going well. It is important with everything that will be going on that we keep this a data driven model.

Dr. Schultz – this is a focused conversation that needs to take place.

Becky – we had a great year and we were able to fund a lot of instructional equipment. Now it is time to consider the personnel needs.

d. CCSSE Update - Rebecca
Rebecca’s area has been working with the CCSSE group and sent them all of the information related to every single section that we offer. CCSSE will take that list and randomly select the sections that will be targeted. Rebecca will forward this list out to the committee but please note that none of these people have been notified. We need to contact the fulltime and part-time faculty that have been selected. The surveys should be here in a couple of weeks. We have some flexibility in how we send them out to the faculty so if they have a test on a particular day or whatever, we can send the survey out when it works better with their schedule. The survey will take almost the entire class period, 50 minutes, to complete. Between SJC and MVC it looks like 55 sections will be targeted. There are a few at Temecula and none at SGP. We didn’t have a choice on what was selected and it doesn’t look like there is any repetition. The class sizes range from 20-40 students. We will send an email to the faculty that has been selected. We would like communication to come from Dr. Schultz, Dr. Pat and the Academic Senate. We have a draft template letter. We also have to email all of the students to let them know about the survey and will work with IT to do that. As the surveys are completed we will mail them back individually. Students don’t always know their student IDs. (Instructors have access to that – it is on the student roster or could be in the gradebook). Other institutions recommend you send the roster with the packet or individually provide the student with a card that has it. The student doesn’t have to have the ID but it is better for the college when we start to disaggregate the data.
e. **Accreditation Update – Rebecca**

We received notification that our mid-term report was accepted and that we have no further reports due until our next self-study in spring of 2018.

Dr. Schultz – institutions need more time to transition to the new standards.

Rebecca – we will begin to pull together the self-study committee in spring of 2016.

Rebecca shared the latest actions of the Accreditation Commission. She also shared some themes from the latest actions that included student learning outcomes; use of the results of decision making, planning and resource allocations; required component in faculty evaluations and that will have to be a conversation with our union and Academic Senate; required presence in course syllabi and we are good there; expansion of non-credit and community services; public disclosures of outcomes at program level and everything we have is listed on line. For what was tagged and mentioned MSJC is in good standing. Distance Ed and a need for a plan were also cited but we are good there too. Substantive interaction and assure that quality is the same as on ground instruction, not the same as qualities that meet the standards (Rebecca will talk with Micah on this); Program elimination timely component of program review for relevance of college admission and student protection; institution set standards for learning and achievement; use of the results to improve were also included. Each year we are required to review our institution set standards and we have those. Finally, Boards training and orientation and understanding of roles and developing policies. She will continue to review the evaluation reports but because ACCJC is moving to new standards everything will shift.

Dr. Schultz – although it is supposed to be a repackaging of existing standards to make it more simple, the feedback he is getting it is that it isn’t easier it is just different packaging.
Lorraine – there is a huge push back from the statewide Academic Senate. It is the Senate’s position that a lot of the new standards are treading on academic and professional matters that are the purview of the Senate. The evaluation of the faculty is negotiated but the Senate has a role in that too. Everyone wants to meet the standards but we want to make sure we respect our processes too and the Senate has a voice to represent the faculty. We need to have a bigger faculty voice and encourage more faculty to participate on the accreditation teams.

3. **Other Information/Updates**

Rebecca – we will place the rubric back on the next agenda and have a discussion on the staffing plan and how we fit personnel back into the RAP/PAR.

4. **Next Meeting – March 17, 2015**

5. **Adjourn**
   
m/s Slattery-Farrell/Searl-Chapin
   Moved to adjourn.
   Motion passed