

Mendocino College Academic Senate Meeting
AGENDA

November 8, 2018

12:30 - 2:00pm

LLRC Room 4210

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of the Agenda

III. Approval of the Minutes

A. October 25, 2018

B. October 29, 2018

IV. Public Comment

Members of the public may address the Senate on any agenda item after being recognized by the Chair. Due to the brevity of the meeting and the length of most agendas, the total amount of time for public comment will be limited to 10 minutes.

V. Special Reports

A. Distance Education Committee: Vivian Varela, Chair

(15 minutes)

- Administrative Procedure 407.1
<https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/policies/AP4071.pdf>
- “ACCJC Thought Paper on Peer Review of Distance Education”

B. Facilities Committee: Steve Cardimona and Jim Xerogeanes, Members

(15 minutes)

- Report on recent committee discussions and upcoming decisions

VI. Old Business

A. Committee Appointments - *Action*

(5 minutes)

- Recommendations to be presented

B. Ruffalo Noel Levitz Climate Survey - *Discussion*

(10 minutes)

- Review of the Academic Senate meeting with Dr. Trites (10/29/2018) and “Exit Report” presentation (10/30/2018)

VII. Standing Items

(20 minutes)

A. Guided Pathways

- Presentation: *Overview of Guided Pathways Structures*: President Indermill

B. Accreditation

- November 5, 2018 Steering Committee meeting report

C. Assembly Bill 705

- Pertinent updates, as appropriate

IX. Senate Reports

(5 minutes)

A. President Indermill

B. Other

X. Open Forum

Members of the public, as well as senators, may address the senate with comments that are within the purview of the Academic Senate. The total amount of time allotted will be determined and announced by the chair based upon the scheduled adjournment time.

XI. Adjournment

Distance Education Committee Report

Vivian Varela, Chairperson

Meeting days/times (if regularly scheduled) Second Friday of the month 1:00-2:00 PM

- 1) What are the most pressing issues your committee is currently addressing? Please be specific.
 - Preparing for full participation in the **CVC-OEI Consortium**: this includes having at least 20% of our online courses approved/badged as Exchange Ready (having met the OEI Course Design Rubric) for fall 2019 and implementation of online counseling/student services for online students (Cranium Café & Quest for Success).
 - Accreditation visit in spring 2020. According to a recent white paper from ACCJC there are new expectations for Distance Education programs in the standards: these include having all online/hybrid courses fully comply with the federal standard “regular and substantive contact” as we (Mendocino College) have set forth in BOT Policy/Procedure; that our courses are NOT correspondence courses; and concerns about overall course rigor and quality.
- 2) What actions (if any) has your committee undertaken to address these challenges?
 - We attempted a pilot for an in-house peer online course review in spring 2018, it was not successful due to inadequate training for the DE committee faculty members who were tasked with reviewing courses using sections A – C of the OEI Course Design Rubric. The committee has agreed that selected faculty will take the OEI Peer Online Course Review training class and receive a stipend for completing the training and evaluating up to five courses. This will (hopefully) happen in early spring 2019.
 - To prepare for the upcoming ACCJC team visit in spring 2020, the DE committee is recommending that faculty members who are currently serving on the DE committee review all online courses for components that show evidence our program is meeting the standards. This would be a checklist for faculty to know where their classes meet basic standards or need improvement. For any faculty that are need assistance, faculty members of the DE committee would provide guidance in ways to meet the standards. See the proposed check list at the end of this document. See BOT AP 407.1 provided to support the checklist.
- 3) How can the Academic Senate be of assistance in handling these issues? (Please see the primary purview of senate listed below in the “10+1” if needed.)
 - Recognition of the (pending) ASCCC adoption of 9.03 F18 Local Adoption of the California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative Course Design Rubric in our local Academic Senate.
 - The DE committee is seeking AS support for the review of all online courses in early spring 2019 to allow for time to assist faculty in bringing their course(s) in line with accreditation standards.

Proposed Online Class Review Checklist (**Y**es, **N**o, **P**artial)

- Course navigation is easy for students to determine
- Instructor contacts students at the beginning of the course
- Course design includes regular instructor initiated contact with students using Canvas communication tools
- Students are encouraged to contact instructor with contact information and expected response times
- Students are interacting with each other in the online course environment
- Instructor presence is part of the course content, i.e., if publisher provided content is used the instructor has also added/personalized to reflect presence

Comments by reviewer

AP 407.1 Distance Education Procedures Regular Effective Contact

All Distance Education courses at Mendocino College, whether hybrid or fully online, will include regular effective contact as described below. Instructors shall clearly state their regular effective contact procedures in their syllabi and other course documents.

Frequency of Interaction and Student Contact

Instructors shall regularly communicate with the class as a whole through announcements, open-ended question forums, etc. These communications will take place at least weekly. Instructors shall regularly initiate interaction with individual students to determine that they are accessing and comprehending course material and that they are participating regularly in the activities in the course. These interactions should include responses in open forums, feedback on assignments, etc., and should take place at least weekly. Response time to student questions shall be no more than 72 hours in most situations. Should the instructor be out of contact for longer than 72 hours, notification to students shall be made in the announcements area of the course. This notice will include a date when the students can expect regular effective contact to resume.

Type of Initiated Interaction and Student Contact

Mendocino College Distance Education courses shall use the following methods of communication to initiate contact with students:

- Announcements in the Course Management System
- Discussion forums with appropriate instructor participation
- Timely response to student emails or inquiries
- Timely feedback for student work

Instructors may also choose other optional forms of communication including but not limited to:

- General email
- Instructor prepared e-lectures or introductions to any publisher created materials
- Group or individual meetings, including review and study sessions
- Field trips
- Telephone conversations
- CCC Confer and video conference
- Podcasts

ACCJC Thought Paper on Peer Review of Distance Education

December 18, 2017

Introduction

The Commission [Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education](#) (in compliance with federal regulation [34 CFR § 602.3](#)) specifies that all learning opportunities provided by accredited institutions must have equivalent quality, accountability, and focus on student outcomes, regardless of mode of delivery. Therefore, any institution offering courses and programs through distance education or correspondence education is expected to meet the requirements of accreditation in each of its courses and programs and at each of its sites, and any institution offering courses through distance education can expect that peer review teams will evaluate distance education courses and programs to ensure that the institution is providing equivalent quality, accountability, and focus on student outcomes.

For its part, in order to promote consistency in the ways in which peer review teams evaluate distance education at institutions, the ACCJC recognizes that institutions and peer review teams need a framework for evaluating such courses and programs. The purpose of this thought paper is to propose a framework for consistent peer review processes of distance education throughout the region.

Guidelines for Evaluating Distance Education (section taken from Thought Paper)

The guidelines below are suggested activities intended to promote consistency (1) in the way that institutions prepare for the peer review team, and (2) in the way that peer review teams observe distance education, especially online classes.

1. Guide for institutions:

- A. In its ISER, among its evidence of meeting either Standard II.A.1 or II.A.2, the college should include the following:
 - Its own policy, if it has one, on ensuring that content and methodology for teaching distance education are equivalent to those of face-to-face courses and programs.
 - Its own definitions and guidelines for best practices for “regular and substantive” interaction between instructor and students. These may be written in administrative procedures, standard operating procedures, a faculty handbook, curriculum handbook, or similar document as appropriate to the institution.
 - Evidence of faculty training on best practices for “regular and substantive” interaction in distance education.
- B. In preparation for the Comprehensive Peer Review Visit:
 - The college should inform distance education faculty that the peer review team will “observe” a randomly selected cadre of distance education classes.
 - The college should work with the Team Chair regarding the random selection of fully online distance education classes to observe. The college should select no fewer than 15 separate sections but no more than 10% of the total number of distance education sections offered in one semester. When possible, it is preferred that the peer reviewers have access to archived distance education classes from the semester immediately preceding the semester of the visit, affording them the opportunity to observe “regular and substantive” interaction through a full semester, quarter, or shortened term.

Another benefit of providing peer reviewers access to the prior term's online classes is that the reviewers' presence in the online class will not interfere with the instruction or the course design. Such interference has been a concern of online instructors, making them reluctant to allow access to visitors.

- The college should inform the peer review team of instructions for access to the randomly selected classes.
- The college should expect that the peer review team will maintain confidentiality of student and instructor information.

Facilities Committee Report will be provided at the meeting.

Academic Senate President's Report

President's Policy Advisory Council

At the October 11th meeting we were presented with the various Board Policies and Administrative Procedure for a first reading (BP 4040 / AP 4040.1, BP 5015 / AP 5015.1 and BP 5110 / AP 5110.1). There was considerable concern about BP 4040 and AP 4040.1 Library and Learning Support Services, thus I asked these not be given a second reading until I could work with the faculty a little more in understanding the recommended changes. At the October 26th meeting, I represented the counseling faculty concerns about BP 5110 and AP 5110.1, while there was considerable discussion of these they passed, despite my objections. Minor revisions to BP 5015 and AP 5015.1 were made and these passed as well. As soon as the revisions are made and available for these documents I will send them to the faculty.

President Reyes indicated he had attended a meeting with classified staff in which they indicated a desire to address our current policy and procedure for tobacco use on campus. I mentioned that faculty, staff, management and students had been working together to request Arturo put BP 305 and AP 305.1 on a PPAC agenda.

- <https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/policies/BP305.pdf>
- <https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/policies/AP3051.pdf>

Arturo suggested we don't need this request if the committee members wanted to review them. I volunteered to draft revisions of the BP and AP aligning them with the Chancellor's Office Resolution with the intent is to put these revised drafts on the December PPAC agenda.

- http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2018_agendas/May/2.7-Attachment-1-CYAD-Smoke-Free-CCC-Resolution.pdf

Board Policies 4250, 5205 and 5210 with Administrative Procedures 5210.1 were on the agenda for a first reading and have been sent out to faculty for input, questions, etc.

MLCCD Climate Survey Ruffalo Noel Levitz

At the request of the Senate (10/25) we held a Special Meeting Monday morning (10/29) to discuss our role and interest in reviewing the Ruffalo Noel Levitz Climate Survey results and potential recommendations for engaging faculty in process and/or strategies for institutional future planning. We agreed it is important that the Ruffalo Noel Levitz representative, Dr. Trites understands California Education Code and Title 5 Regulations related to the Academic Senate's purview and participatory governance if we plan to engage in an ongoing dialog about the survey results.

Most of the senators and I meet with Dr. David Trites (RNL Representative) and Minerva Flores on Monday, 10/29. I appreciate all who were able to attend this meeting given the very short notice we received. We explained the significance of the Academic Senate in terms of leadership across the constituent groups and our willingness to work cooperatively with him in making campus improvements in campus-wide moral. We discussed the meaning of "participatory governance", shared copies of the role of the Academic Senate (10 + 1), Board Policy 213 and Administrative Procedure 213.1

<https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/policies/BP213.pdf>

<https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/policies/AP2131.pdf>

We recommended to Dr. Trites that a small group of constituent leaders review the comments from the climate survey in order to honor the process established by the District and RNL. We indicated that if folks made comments, as requested, the expectation is for them to be read. It is assumed that some administrators/management have had access to this information. Therefore other constituent leaders should have this information, as well. It is more helpful and truer to the process if we summarize the information from our local lens. Outside opinions are welcome and encouraged, but we have a better sense of the college community than anyone else.

While the meeting seemed productive I am not sure the impact it may have had, as the follow up meeting "Exit Report" (Tuesday) did not seem to include our thoughts and comments about the next steps and ongoing process. At the meeting Monday, he indicated supported our proposal to have a small group of constituent leaders (we recommended two from each group, including a member of the Board) meet to review and summarize the survey comments. He indicated that the District did not have copies of the comments. However, on Tuesday, he did not mention our suggestion, said no one would be provided the comments, as doing so may compromise confidentiality. At the close of the meeting, however, he told those present that the District did indeed have copies of the comments.

Accreditation

I am on Substandard Teams I and IV, both of which meet 10/22. Currently the focus of our work is to identify and document specific evidence that aligns with each of specific substandard.

The Steering Committee is scheduled to meet on Monday, 11/5 to review our progress and discuss next steps. My thought is that the evidence gathering is going to take more time than anticipated and we need to allow for this so we are sure to have a sample of documents that accurately demonstrates how we align with the Standards.

ASCCC Plenary Session

I attended numerous sessions about various aspects of AB 705 and its impact on the college and benefit to students. Thus far, I think we are on the right track in our discussions, discipline faculty involvement and curriculum committee decision-making under the direction of the Academic Senate. Guided Pathways was another main focus at the meetings I attended. I will share a broader summary of topics, including the final resolutions passed, at a later date.