Instructional Advisory Council Meeting

March 21, 2014

8 am – 9:30 am

I. Q&A Session/Introduction

A. What can we do to get minutes in a more formalized fashion? Minutes will be taken and posted on an intranet page. Continuous posting will be a work in progress by the CIO (and his team).

B. Student Equity Committee and need for instructional faculty to be involved. The Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Plan in October 2014; Student Equity Plan is due in November 2014. All faculty members are encouraged to be involved and should contact Michael Wilding if interested. Requests for proposal of ideas regarding student equity will be made with a cross-discipline analysis of various sectors of the College. We need to develop a program that meets the needs of all of our students; the student equity plan is designed to help close achievement gaps. First, we must determine what gaps in achievement based on analyses of data. Next, we should create ways to address and bridge those gaps. A concern over a “secret committee” being formed was noted; this is not the case (and was made as a joke during the recent College Planning Team meeting on March 17th). Other aspects of SSSP, as learned by Jerry during the recent spring 2014 CIO/CSSO conference, were discussed with the group such as approaches to addressing counseling deficiencies, the various delivery modes for curriculum (including Weekend College, non-credit and enhanced non-credit, fee-based through ETI, etc.). The importance of “pathways” for students was also discussed in our collective efforts to help students succeed by guiding them through their sequences of coursework. Ann Lowe discussed that the Curriculum Committee is going to be examining GE requirements, both what is required by the State and what is required locally, in an effort to create clearer pathways for students.
C. Importance of Institutional Effectiveness reporting and tie-in to Program Review. The CIO hopes that our College can move in the direction of considering the value of SLOs as a tool to improve learning every year and not necessarily a workload issue.

II. Workload for Department Chairs

A. Jerry reported out that at the recent spring 2014 CIO/CSSO Conference, workload concerns and the impact on constituencies at the State Chancellor’s Office. For example, the State Chancellor’s office is down to one-third staffing in the instructional office. The Instruction Office at COC may be able to provide some assistance with the hiring of short-term employees to assist with division workload while potentially consolidating office space. Jerry has committed to supporting both department chairs and deans, to the extent of providing some discretionary funding, to support hiring temporary part-time employees during small strategic periods of time.

B. Instructional Calendar: The current instructional calendar was discussed along with the challenges that it presents for department chairs. Program Review should be completed in the fall, and budgeting should be done during the next spring. Overall, Jerry would like to make changes to the current planning calendar in an effort to distribute the workload more evenly. He asked for input from the department chairs. It was noted that it will take 2 – 3 years to change the way the institution operates. We want to be able to perform our various functions well; concentrating these responsibilities during the spring semester only dilutes our efforts to best serve students.

C. Adjuncts and the recently ratified AFT Contract: One faculty member asked about the current AFT contract and need for an integrated approach to get input from department chairs. For example, one concern brought up had to do with restrictions from the AFT contract regarding scheduling. Several items in the recently ratified AFT contract affect a department chair’s ability to make best decisions regarding scheduling. Eligibility lists was an issue – we do not want to adversely affect Instruction and the department chair’s ability to
staff. That is, when a brand new instructor is only evaluated one time and teaches for four semesters, they now automatically become “eligible”, which limits the ability for a department chair to staff if perhaps everyone is “eligible”. Another concern had to do with keeping department chairs in the loop during AFT contract negotiations, although it was acknowledged that due process does not necessarily allow for input from chairs during AFT negotiations with the District. The group was reminded that information is still disseminated by the Instruction representative on AFT to the deans and department chairs whenever possible (during prior department chair meetings), and that deans should make sure to review any discussion items with their department chairs.

D. Adjuncts, CurricUNET, and SLOs: Jerry brought up the issue of allocating work to part-time faculty. It was noted that, for example, part-time faculty cannot input their own SLO assessments through the new CurricUNET SLO Assessment Module. Several years ago, it was noted that adjuncts did have curriculum access through WebCMS. With the current CurricUNET system, if an adjunct has log-in ability, then they can access both the SLO module as well as curriculum. The modern concern was that adjuncts would create a course and then if they leave the College, there would be problems that the chair had to contend with. The question was posed: how about formulating a work group with chairs that can brainstorm on what constitutes an appropriate professional FLEX activity for adjuncts as related to assisting with department workload, and ensure that it meets with appropriate statewide guidelines for FLEX? It was noted that the current AFT contract allows for adjunct faculty members who attend College sponsored FLEX and approved department activities (can) earn their regular hourly rate for up to 5 hours and up to an additional 4 hours of FLEX at the non-instructional rate for each fall and spring semester. Omar will contact Lisa Hooper and Teresa Ciardi (Professional Development Committee co-chairs) to set up an ad hoc committee to begin this process. Balance between clerical workload and assessing outcomes results. It is requested that chairs go back and reflect on the year-long workload: is there a time when
our chairs may need more support, and can we obtain support from Instruction? Need better communication between the various departments and divisions. CurricUNET assessment module was initially purchased with the mindset of access for all. Does this include adjuncts, and will department chairs be held accountable? Other aspects for consideration involve giving adjuncts an access to a particular section for log-in purposes regarding SLO assessments. Paul will work on this. Integrated planning and SLO assessment discussions need to occur. One proposal is to have a check-off box through MyCanyons for SLO results to be noted by each instructor per section. However, it is also important to ensure there is ongoing dialogue regarding the SLO results.

E. One final aspect that was brought up included the impact of personnel changes and how it influences departments (e.g., staffing changes via adult hourly, a full-time faculty member that becomes an administrator) and the impact it has on departments and remaining faculty with respect to workload and related considerations.

III. FTES and Productivity – in a prior email, Jerry sent an email with handouts which review FTES, FTEF, WSCH, and Instructional Efficiency (WSCH/FTEF). Please see these handouts for additional information.

A. One department chair asked about 525 – where does this come from? 15 hours per week (for a full-time student) x 35 weeks = 525 (slightly higher for compressed calendars, but this number works for our purposes)
B. Calculating FTES
C. Weekly Student Contact Hours
D. Instructional Efficiency (WSCH/FTEF)

IV. Program Viability Policy (Edel Alonso) – please see email from Dr. Alonso addressing BP 4021.

A. Required by law – Ed Code, Title 5, and ACCJC Standards
B. The faculty Senate first had to define a “Program” – an organized sequence of a course or courses that leads to a degree, certificate, etc.
C. Timeline – proposals must be submitted within the first 6 weeks of the fall semester. Some proposals may be initiated afterwards if there is compelling need.

D. Initiated by CIO, dean, department chair, academic program director.

E. Evidence for need for program should be data driven and can include a multitude of evidential information such as enrollment trends over 5 years, projected demand, frequency of course offerings, persistence, student success, completion rates, productivity, passing licensing exams, enrolment trends, data from APR and CTE Advisory Committee, regional labor data, etc.

F. Additional requirements for CTE: local job market study of the labor market area along with labor market requirements every two years thereafter to ensure its necessity (by the Board).

G. Program Viability Committee consists of tenured faculty from inside/outside the division, dean, academic senate president, AFT union president, counselor, curriculum committee chair, and member of APR committee. This committee is formed once the process is initiated by any member noted in part D above.

H. Factors to consider when considering a proposed program: relevance of a discipline…does it match with the mission of college, disproportionate impact, articulation, ability to transfer, ability to meet standards of accrediting agencies, etc.

I. A written report is then submitted to the Academic Senate, which will contain rationale for approval or denial. At this point, while curriculum presumably hasn’t been formally entered into CurricUNET yet (until program is approved), the initiating author should give a substantial overview of the necessary courses to support the program.

J. Possible Senate verdict may include recommendations to: initiate, not initiate, modify, continue, continue with qualifications, discontinue, etc. Committee recommendations shall be submitted by week 5 of the subsequent spring semester.

K. Senate decision is forwarded to the CEO for submission to the Board of Trustees for approval.
L. The Academic Senate President will work with the CEO to its completion.

M. What about GE and Basic Skills – do these constitute a “Program” at COC?

N. A concern about CTE arose regarding what labor market data/statistics should be presented to the Board to justify labor market requirements every two years. Jerry commented that there is a statewide initiative through the CTE LaunchBoard (Cal-PASS Plus) to address retrieving relevant data.