



## Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

**Date:** Friday, March 25, 2016

**Time/Location:** 1-3 PM / WCC Room 113

### Senate Roles and Responsibilities (The 10+1)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines.</li> <li>2. Degree and certificate requirements</li> <li>3. Grading policies</li> <li>4. Educational program development</li> <li>5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success</li> <li>6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports</li> <li>8. Policies for faculty professional development activities</li> <li>9. Processes for program review</li> <li>10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development</li> <li>11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate</li> </ol> |
|--|--|

**Senators:** **Matt Clark** (President), **Donna McGill-Cameron** (CTE), **Donna Bahneman** (Adjunct), **Jaya Shah** (Math & Science), **Kevin Ferns** (Secretary, FaLaHum), **Greg Gassman** (Social Science), **Pam Geer** (Adjunct At-large), **Christopher Howerton** (VP, At-large), **Jose Vallejo** (Student Services)

**Ex-officio Members:** **Mike Papin** (Lake County Campus Faculty)

**Absent:** **Omar Huerta** (ASWCC Rep)

**Guests:** **Vice President Konuwa**, **Heidi Morgan** (Via Tandberg from LCC), **Jennifer Henson** (Via Tandberg from LCC)

Call to order 1:03 p.m.

Item	Description-Type	Lead	Background and Objective
I	<b>Approval of Agenda - Action</b>		Approve agenda of 3/25/16 (MSC Gassman/Bahneman)
II	<b>Public Comment</b>		Guests are welcome to comment on any item on the agenda or not on the agenda. For items on the agenda, they may comment now or during the discussion of that item.
	<i>Discussion</i>		
III	<b>Approval of Minutes-Action</b>		Approve the minutes of 3/11/16 as amended (MSC Howerton/Gassman)
	<i>Discussion/Decision:</i>		
IV	<b>President's Report - Information/Discussion</b>	Clark	
	<i>Discussion/Decision:</i>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See the attached report.</li> <li>2. The Library Advisory Committee met this morning and is considering recommending extending library evening hours and opening on Saturdays as well. Staffing increases are also being considered in the form of an adjunct librarian and a library technician. Library SLOs will also be discussed.</li> </ol>		
V	<b>Vice President's Report</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Committee Appointments – Action</b></li> <li>2. <b>Curriculum Update – Information/Discussion</b></li> <li>3. <b>Other – Information/Discussion</b></li> </ol>	Howerton	<b>Objective:</b> 1.Appoint faculty members to committees. 2. Receive update on work of the Curriculum Committees.

	<p><i>Discussion/Decision:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If you are on a committee in need of members for the fall semester, please contact Howerton.</li> <li>2. The full time accounting position will be refilled and an advisory committee will be formed. Howerton will send out a call for volunteers.</li> <li>3. A "sandbox" version of the new Curricunet Meta will be released for faculty to check all the fields in the new program.</li> <li>4. The curriculum committee is looking at the computer advisory for course outlines and may revise it.</li> <li>5. The DE handbook is being revised and any suggestions should be forwarded to J. Brown.</li> <li>6. The Woodland Opera House is now showing Westside Story. Check it out.</li> <li>7. Many faculty have been approached in a last minute manner to assist in an upcoming accreditation report. The BSI Grant due date is today and many faculty worked hard on this. Regarding maintenance requests, there was a decision made to change the reporting protocol and it unfortunately caused some stress to a faculty member. On the topic of grants, there is a question as to whether faculty should be going after grants or if administration is pursuing grants, and where/how faculty should step in. There is no protocol regarding grants.</li> <li>8. Howerton reports that the SLO Committee is developing a new iSLO assessment plan to align with completion by design.</li> </ol>		
VI	Senate/Committee Reports - Information	Senate	
	<p><i>Discussion/Decision:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. McGill-Cameron reports that members of the division are disappointed that no physical fitness facility is being planned. The Yoga Club meets Thursdays 3-3:30 p.m. Faculty are welcome. Also, she reports that she does not have access to survey results for flex events. She would like this access.</li> <li>2. Gassman reports that the Ethnic Studies Department is scheduled to present at the Pacific Sociological Association on 3/26/16 in Oakland. The Ethnic Studies Department was invited to a table at the City of Woodland Cesar Chavez Celebration on 3/31/16. The Ethnic Studies Departments is scheduled to present at the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies on 4/6-4/9 in Denver. The Chicano Studies Class is planning the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Si Se Puede Recognition Event on 5/5/16 in the Community Room.</li> <li>3. Shah reports that 12 groups visited and 3 groups made bids to create the new cadaver room.</li> <li>4. Ferns reports that a member of his division recently submitted a request through Netfacilities to replace the batteries in the clock in her class. Netfacilities does not accept email addresses from faculty as of this week. She was informed by the help desk that all facilities and maintenance requests must now go through the dean. Faculty would like to know if a change in procedures has been made.</li> <li>5. Ferns reports that a member's classroom projector bulb is not at full strength. Other class projector bulbs are also fading. She has heard from the dean that the projectors are out of date, and that bulbs may not be available. She is photocopying materials for students instead of projecting them on the overhead, but she would like to save the district money and resources by using the projector rather than printing up lots of materials. She hopes WCC can find a solution to the problem.</li> <li>6. The dean recently contacted the FALAHUM division about adding a dual enrollment art appreciation class at a local high school for the fall. The division supports building the art program in a comprehensive, as opposed to piecemeal, manner and is happy that additional allocation is being considered in art. When WCC's full time art instructor retired a few years ago, the art program disintegrated and has not recovered. We are no longer able to offer an art major at WCC because we don't offer the full complement of art classes. In fact, we are not even offering more than 3 art sections per semester (a rotation of the same 4 classes), which is equal to the number of sections offered by the Sutter Center. In comparison, YC is offering 29 art sections and is able to offer a major in art. A full time art instructor should be hired to refill that vacancy. The ESL department is suffering a similar fate, as we did not rehire a full time faculty in ESL after the full time faculty member retired a few years ago. A full time ESL instructor should be hired to refill that vacancy.</li> </ol>		

	<p>7. Ferns submits/reads a letter from Cay Strode to the grant writer and members of the FALAHUM Division:</p> <p>I appreciate the hard work that has been done to date on the Basic Skills RFA. I understand that these grants are important for the success of our students; however, the timeline for this particular grant has, unfortunately, been accelerated beyond the usual quick timelines we've had in the past. I note that the RFA was released January 21st yet our department's input was not solicited until March 7th and the request for full write ups not received from the grant writer until March 16th, nine days before the application due date. In the meantime, many colleges were able to avail themselves of February workshops designed to help schools develop competitive grants. Now we are all attempting to throw something cohesive together at one of the busiest times of the semester for faculty and staff.</p> <p>I understand that this is sometimes how it all goes; however, it appears that we are once again heading down a path that we have gone down with the last few HSI grant applications. The people whose work is being solicited are all hard working and committed to student success; I'm sure all of us would be very happy to sit down and start planning for next year's iteration of this grant, and do so in such a way that we are able to develop a thoughtful plan that truly serves students' needs.</p> <p>8. Geer reports that an adjunct faculty member may be able to manage a program in the absence of a full time member. ESL may be one example of this.</p> <p>9. Geer asks who receives the petitions for certificates. She is worried that students may not be getting petitions in a timely manner. (Sonia Horn receives them.)</p> <p>10. Vallejo reports that the ESL program has been mismanaged for some time now, and we do a disservice to the community by not focusing on our ESL offerings.</p> <p>11. Vallejo reports that Student Services faculty still feel they are being micromanaged and that there are too many layers between faculty and students.</p> <p>12. Vallejo reports that Admissions and Records was closed on Thursday afternoon. No notice was given to Student Services.</p> <p>13. The First Year Experience is being promoted in local participating high schools. When Student Services returned to the campus, the faculty discovered that much of the information they shared with students was incorrect. They asked administration to contact the high schools to tell students that the program will not be free, as was initially reported.</p> <p>14. Vallejo reports that there are concerns regarding how outreach is being developed and used. The communication among student services is also not as effective as it could be. A counselor recently went to a high school when an outreach specialist had just been there two days prior. Proper coordination would have prevented some confusion in a situation like this.</p>		
VII	<b>Ex-officio Reports - Information</b>	Papin, Huerta	
	<p><i>Discussion/Decision:</i></p> <p>1. Papin reports that the LCC graduation is being planned as the last YC graduation. The sign on the highway now says Woodland Community College as well.</p>		
VIII	<b>Draft WCC Distance Education (DE) Handbook – Information/Discussion</b>	Senate	<p><b>Background:</b> The Curriculum Committee has drafted a DE Handbook and forwarded it to senate for eventual adoption.</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> First senate review of the handbook with to provide feedback prior to a second review and adoption.</p>
	<p><i>Discussion/Decision:</i></p> <p>1. This is a very rough draft. The senate will look at this again in a future meeting, and it will be sent out to all faculty for future review. J. Hanson states that the phrase “original content” in the handbook is unclear. Also, how will student contact be evaluated? We should note the difference between expectations for online vs. face to face classes.</p>		
IX	<b>Resolutions for Discussion at Area A Meeting –</b>	Senate	<p><b>Background:</b> Prior to the ASCCC Spring Plenary. The initial slate of resolutions will be discussed at Area Meetings. The</p>

	<b>Information/Discussion</b>		Area A Meeting will take place at Butte College on April 1. <b>Objective:</b> Review the resolutions to inform the discussion at the Area A Meeting.
	<i>Discussion/Decision:</i> 1. Clark reports that each plenary has a large docket of resolutions for approval. Area A's meeting is next Friday at Butt College. Usually 1 to 2 people attend from each college. New resolutions can be formed at the meeting too. A flex activity will be scheduled to discuss and offer feedback on the resolutions. Senators express support for Resolution, 1.01, Mentoring of Adjunct Faculty.		
X	<b>Spring Plenary and Other Upcoming ASCCC Events – Information/Discussion</b>	Senate	<b>Background:</b> Upcoming ASCCC events include Spring Plenary (April 21-23, Sacramento), CTE Leadership Institute (May 5-7, Anaheim), Faculty Leadership Institute (June 9-11, Riverside), and Curriculum Institute (July 7-9, Anaheim). <b>Objective:</b> Ensure healthy WCC attendance at these events.
	<i>Discussion/Decision:</i> 1. Please consider attending one or more of the events.		
XI	<b>Division Liaisons (Chairs) and Division Structure – Update</b>	Senate	<b>Background:</b> The senate and administration are exploring the establishment of Data Inquiry Group (DIG) Liaisons (roughly, division chairs). <b>Objective:</b> Review an updated Data Inquiry Group Charge Statement.
	<i>Discussion/Decision: Not addressed</i>		
XII	<b>College Handbook Committee Template – Information/Discussion</b>	Senate	<b>Background:</b> As part of an effort to update the WCC College Handbook, College Council recently looked at a draft Committee Purpose Statement template. <b>Objective:</b> Review the draft template and provide feedback.
	<i>Discussion/Decision: Not addressed</i>		
XIII	<b>Senate Election Processes - Discussion</b>	Senate	<b>Background:</b> The Bylaws are weak regarding elections. The process for electing VP and Secretary need (re)definition. The timeline proved problematic this year. No process or practices exist for campaigning in contested elections. <b>Objective:</b> Discuss these and related concerns with the intent of informing Bylaws revisions.
	<i>Discussion/Decision: Not addressed</i>		
XIV	<b>Future Agenda Items- Discussion</b>		Lake County Campus Representation on Governance Committees, College Catalog, SSS Priorities, CCC, ADA in the Classroom
	<i>Discussion/Decision: Not addressed</i>		

Meeting adjourned 3:00 p.m. (MSC Gassman/Geer)

Senate Goals, 2015-2016			
#	Goal	Who	Status
1	<b>Student Success:</b> Identify and address barriers to student success (counseling availability, course offerings...).	Clark, Bahneman,	Underway in Student Success Committee
2	<b>Curriculum:</b> Create catalog/class schedule subcommittee (via curriculum and scheduling committees), increase faculty awareness, establish program development structure and incorporate with EMP.	McGill, Howerton	Ongoing
3	<b>Lake County Campus (LCC) Transition:</b> Integrate the faculty, staff, and students at the Clear Lake Campus into the governance, planning, and budgetary processes at WCC.	Clark, Howerton, Papin	Non-senate committee recommendation to be forwarded to committees for consideration.
4	<b>Sabbatical Leave:</b> (Re)define the sabbatical leave process in light of the	Clark	In (slow) progress

Senate Goals, 2015-2016			
#	Goal	Who	Status
	multi-college transition.		
5	<b>Faculty Evaluation:</b> Improve the faculty evaluation process.	Clark, Howerton, Geer	In (slow) progress
6	<b>Grading Policies:</b> Review, update, and distribute Faculty Handbook.	Clark	Awaiting Work of CLAS
7	<b>Colusa County Campus (CCC):</b> Create comprehensive process for Colusa County Outreach Facility (CCOF).	Clark, Geer	Midway through CCC Compression Planning. Need to assess the meshing of the compression planning with identified gaps at CCC.
8	Revise <b>Senate Constitution and Bylaws.</b>	Clark, McGill, Gassman, Ferns	Constitution revision to a vote in April
9	<b>Sustainability and Grant Funding:</b> Define process for seeking grants and sustaining work after grants or categorical funds expire.	Clark, Konuwa	Discussed without detail in both senate /administration leadership meetings and B&P.
10	<b>Education Master Plan (EMP):</b> Work with College Council to create the new WCC EMP.		Budget and Planning is prioritizing work from 1/29 EMP activity.
11	<b>Distributive Education (DE):</b> Work with the Curriculum Committee and the Dean of Student Success and Planning to strengthen the WCC DE modality. Work should include, but not be limited to, faculty training, student training, student supplemental resources, and ensuring regular, instructor initiated contact.	Clark, Shah	DE Coordinator position has been established. Julie Brown will fill that role as a special project this semester and has been selected to be coordinator beginning Fall 2016. The senate will review a draft DE Handbook on 3/25 and 4/8.

President's Report  
March 25, 2016

**Meeting with WCC Administration**

**(3/15: Cancelled, President White unavailable)**

**(3/22) – Highlights:**

1. In discussion of the events surrounding a student having a seizure in one of Howerton's classes a number of gaps in WCC's processes were identified: (1) the number for Campus Police was not readily available and there was no answer when campus police were called (twice), (2) there were no administrators in Building 100 or signage indicating who to contact, (3) there was no follow-up from administration or campus police after the incident, and (4) there was no reach out to students in the class who may have been shaken (or worse) by the incident. Although Howerton and his students handled the incident well, under slightly different circumstances, the results may not have been positive. President White will address the issues in the near future.
2. Given the increasing number of people either leaving the district or transferring within the district, Howerton raised questions regarding exit interviews (I had raised some of the questions in DCAS and DC3 over the last 2 years). There will be follow-up with HR regarding if exit interviews take place when someone transfers within the district. The possible usefulness of information from exit interviews was also discussed. At this point although such interviews may take place, the senates have not received and resulting information.
3. A conversation regarding the CCCCO Basic Skills grant application morphed into a philosophical discussion of programs such as StatPathways. The district mathematics faculty has been resistant to pursuing such programs and the reasoning and current thoughts were shared. I also explained the skepticism surrounding data from such programs.

4. Once a decision has been made regarding compensation (or lack thereof) a call out will be issued to form a work group to draft a job description for faculty liaisons.
5. Both the administration and senate have issues regarding dual enrollment that need to be discussed, but time precluded that discussion from taking place at this meeting.

**Budget & Planning and PRVT (3/9) –**

1. We reviewed the one-time expenditures prioritization lists a final time before forwarding to President White.
2. A subset of CHEX has suggested adjusting Perkins funding based on FTES. Our initial position is opposed.
3. Concern has been raised at YC about the Ag/Dual-Enrollment position at WCC and funding for the position after the three years expire. These are similar to concerns raised at WCC (more generally) about sustainability of categorically or grant funded positions.
4. Subgroups were tasked with converting the raw data from the 1-29-16 EMP activity into draft documents for moving forward (Ishikawa, or fish, diagrams). Work should be done prior to Spring Break.
5. Degree Audit maybe in use by Fall Semester 2016. Ed Plan software is not being used consistently at this point.

**DC3 (3/22) – Highlights:**

1. After some further tweaking, a new DC3 Membership was approved. It was agreed to retain representatives from various bargaining units (YCFA, CSEA, YC-AFT). In addition to a CSEA rep from each college, it was agreed to add a CSEA rep from district services. The M&O Director and the Chief of Police were added as resources and the WCC Dean of Planning, Research, and Student Success was removed as a resource. (As an aside to this portion of the agenda, it was announced that the YC interim VP will be leaving to take a position as Provost at CSU Chico. Brian Jukes will cover some duties until a new VP is seated.)
2. We reviewed a draft Integrated Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation Cycle survey that will be conducted after Spring Break. It was agreed to add open comment boxes after each appropriate question (the original draft had open comment boxes after some, but not all appropriate questions.) The survey's focus will be assessing college-wide understanding of the district planning processes.
3. We discussed AP 3570 Smoking and Tobacco/Nicotine Use. The AP will designate all district grounds as smoke free beginning Fall Semester 2016. In many ways, the AP catches the rest of the district up with WCC which has been smoke free for a number of years. Although some minor revisions will take place before adoption, it was agreed that both colleges could advertise as smoke free in the class schedule for Summer/Fall 2016 and reference the AP.
4. Chancellor Houston reported out from the CEO conference that the recommendation to the Board of Governors will be to merge ACCJC and WASC Sr. The chancellor guessed that such a process, if it eventuates, would take between 6 and 10 years to occur. (Therefore both colleges will work on the next self-study under the assumption that we will still be working with ACCJC.) Houston was originally opposed to such a proposal, but after (occasionally rancorous) discussion has come to support the proposal. The advantages of having one body oversee accreditation for the community colleges and the institutions our students transfer to was deemed to have much merit.

**DCAS (3/17, the meeting was shorter than usual due to commitments of the Chancellor and the two College Presidents) – Highlights:**

1. The bulk of the meeting was spent looking at the current progress in transitioning to CurricuNet. Although we are behind where we had hoped to be at this point (primarily due to GoverNet not delivering on a number of promised items, leading N. Kirschner to do a lot of work we were told would be done for us), there is still a chance we can roll out Meta for faculty at Convocation. However it was agreed not to push to meet that deadline. It is important that  $\alpha$ - and  $\beta$ -testing take place. If roll out needs to be delayed past convocation it will be necessary to provide faculty resources (ideally Kirschner whom is heavily invested at this point and is to be applauded for her efforts to date) that carry into Fall Semester. Houston will be meeting with State Vice Chancellor Walker to check-in on the status of Chancellor Office roll-out of new expectations from the State Chancellor's Office regarding

submission of curriculum from colleges. There will be breakout sessions at Spring Plenary that will likely address with the state changes. We did not discuss the need for college faculty articulation officers.

2. Chancellor Houston gave an update on the status of accrediting bodies. This information was prior to the meeting of Consultation Council and of the Board of Governors so much was conjecture about possible paths forward that were obviated by the report from DC3 (see Item 4 above) so in the interest of brevity I will not elaborate herein.

### **Miscellany**

1. In various discussions, concern about the direction of Dual Enrollment and who is driving the curriculum have been raised. We will revisit this topic in April.

## Woodland Community College Distance Education Handbook

**Purpose:** The purpose of this handbook is

- Provide guidance/regulations to instructors interested in teaching Distance Education courses and more specifically online classes. Evaluation of courses will be done using the California Community Colleges – Course Design Rubric for the Online Education Initiative (OEI Rubric)
- Provide parameters for instructors already teaching online classes
- Provide guidance for Woodland Community College Distance Education Committee and Distance Education Plan establishment
- **This Handbook is guided by Yuba Community College District (YCCD) AP 4105 – Distance Education, Approved May 21, 2015 which**  
**References:** Title 5, Section 53200, 55002, 55200, 55202, 55204, 55206, 55210; Federal Regulations 34 CFR 602.17, 34 CFR 668.22, 38 CFR 21.4203; Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. Sec. 794d); California Community Colleges Distance Education Guidelines, March 2008.

I. Purpose of the Distance Education Handbook:

II. AP 4105

Definitions

Course Approval

Certification

Duration of Approval

Student Attendance Dates

III. Faculty Guidance based upon AP4105

A. Course Delivery Definitions:

Online

Hybrid

Web Enhanced

Broadcast Education

B. Regular Effective Contact

B.1 Definitions

Instructor-Student Interaction:



Student-Student Interaction:  
Student-Material Interaction:  
Other Considerations:

- B.2 Contact Expectations
  - C. Online Course Development:
    - C.1 Definition: Substantially Complete
    - C.2 Department/division consultations and approval:
    - C.3 Curriculum committee approval:
    - C.4. Faculty Course Submission to DEC:
    - C.5 DEC Course Review and Evaluation:
  - D. New Course Approval
  - E. Current Course Approval
  - F. Course Standards:
  - G. Intellectual Property Rights Agreement:
- IV. Faculty Approval Process
- A. Required
  - B. Recommended
  - C. Process
- V. Faculty Training
- A. YCCD Training
  - B. External Training:
  - C. Professional Development.
- VI. Course Scheduling
- VII. Action Process
- VIII. Attendance Policy Specific To Online Courses
- A. Participation required:
  - B. Attendance:
- APPENDIX  
LIST once organized

## **I. Purpose of the Distance Education Handbook:**

The Woodland Community College (YC) handbook is to be used as a guide to establishing effective Distance Education (DE) courses to students as well as providing guidance to faculty to develop courses based upon the most current andragogical teaching methods and to meet all local, state and federal requirements. AP 4015 is used as the guiding policy to establish the guidelines.

This handbook has been developed by the YC Distance Education Committee (DEC) with input from faculty appointed to the YC Academic Senate, YC Curriculum Committee (CC), with faculty appointed to the Woodland Community College (WCC) Distance Education Committee (DCE), Woodland Community College Curriculum Committee (CC) and administration at both YC and WCC and with support of YCFA. Each college will develop and maintain their own DE Plan and Handbook, but with an understanding our students will be enrolling across Colleges, it is important that as much as possible, the plans are developed in tandem for each of faculty and students.

We start with AP 4105 and continue to provide expanded information as a guide for interpretation.

## II. AP 4105 (sections applicable to this handbook):

### Definitions:

- Distance Education: Instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by distance and interact through the assistance of communication technology (§ 55200)
- Online: A course that uses web-based tools and in which 100% of the instruction and interaction between instructor and student is done online (proctored exams still allowed for this classification)
- Hybrid: A course that replaces some, but not all, face-to-face class time with web-based tools
- Web Enhanced: A face-to-face course that does not replace any face-to-face seat time but requires access to web-based tools.

### Course Approval:

- The review and approval of new and existing distance education courses shall follow the curriculum approval procedures outlined in Administrative Procedures 4020, Program and Curriculum Development.
- No course shall be taught via distance education until it has been reviewed and received separate approval for distance education by each college's Curriculum Committee. This requirement applies if any portion of the instruction in a course section is designed to be provided through distance education (§ 55206).

### Certification:

When approving distance education courses, the Curriculum Committee will certify the following:

- Course Quality Standards: The same standards of course quality were applied to the distance education courses as are applied to traditional classroom courses (§ 55002, 55202).
- Course Quality Determinations: Determinations and judgments about the quality of the distance education course were made with the full involvement of the Curriculum Committee(s) approval procedures (§ 53200).
- Instructor Contact: Each section of the course that is delivered through distance education will include regular, effective contact between instructor and students (§ 55204). The use of the term "regular, effective contact" in this context suggests that students should have frequent opportunities to interact with the instructor of record.
  - Ensuring regular, effective instructor/student contact guarantees that the student in an online or hybrid course receives the benefit of the instructor's presence in the learning environment both as a provider of instructional information and as a facilitator of student learning. In a face-to-face course the instructor is present at each class meeting and interacts with the class through announcements, lectures, activities and discussions. The instructor also serves as a content advisor when he or she answers questions both as they come up in class and as they arise in individual situations. These types of questions are dealt with via the telephone, email, or face-to-face office visits.

- For distance education courses there are a number of acceptable modes of interaction between student and instructor, not all of which require in-person contact (§ 55204):
- Initiated Interaction: Instructors will regularly initiate interaction with students and determine that they are accessing and comprehending course material and participating regularly in the activities in the course. Providing students with an open-ended question forum, although appropriate, does not constitute the entirety of effective instructor-initiated interaction.
- Frequency: DE courses are considered the equivalent to face-to-face courses. Therefore, the frequency of the contact will be at least the same as would be established in a regular, face-to-face course. Contact shall be distributed in a manner that will ensure that regular contact is maintained over the course of a week and should occur, at the very least, the same number of instructor contact hours per week that would be available for face-to-face students.
- Establishing Expectations and Managing Unexpected Instructor Absence: An instructor- and/or department-established policy describing the frequency and timeliness of instructor initiated contact and instructor feedback, will be posted in the syllabus and/or other course documents that are made available for students when the course officially opens each semester. If the instructor must be out of contact briefly for an unexpected reason (such as illness or a family emergency that takes the instructor offline), notification to students will be made in the announcements area of the course that includes when the students can expect regular, effective contact to resume. If the offline time results in a lengthy absence (i.e. more than three or four days) a substitute instructor should be sought who can assist students while the instructor is unavailable.
- Minimum Contact: Regarding the type of contact that will exist in all YCCD DE courses, instructors will use the following resources to initiate contact with students:
  - Discussion forums (or equivalent) with appropriate instructor participation
  - Email
  - Timely response to student emails or inquiries
  - Weekly announcements in the Learning Management System
  - Timely feedback for student work
  - Instructor-prepared materials (text-based, audio files, and/or video files), in addition to any publisher created materials (written, recorded, broadcast, etc.) that, combined with other course materials, creates the “virtual equivalent” of the face-to-face class
- Other Types of Contact: Instructors may also choose to use other forms of communication, as mentioned in Section 55204 of Title 5. (“...through group or individual meetings, orientation and review sessions, supplemental seminar or study sessions, field trips, library workshops, telephone contact, correspondence, voice mail, e-mail, or other activities”) and/or teleconference, video conference, pod cast, or other synchronous technologies may also be included.
  - It is suggested that instructors should have a threaded discussion that is set aside for general questions about the course and may wish to have weekly or other timely, question and answer sessions available to students. This may also be accomplished through virtual office hours.

#### Student Attendance Dates

Instructors are responsible for verifying student attendance dates in all sections in which:

- Earned and unearned portions of Federal Student Aid (Title IV) are determined based upon the amount of time the student spent in attendance, and/or
- Last actual date of attendance is used to determine status changes for students receiving Veteran (VA-ONCE) funds.

See also:

- WCC Curriculum Handbook: <http://wcc-curriculum.yccd.edu/handbook.aspx>
- YC Curriculum Handbook: <http://php.yccd.edu/documents/viewdocument.php?id=2643>

### III. Faculty Guidance based upon AP4105

#### A. Course Delivery Definitions:

Before faculty offers courses using a DE format, they must first consider the various methods by which a course can be offered. Not all disciplines or courses can or should be offered using a DE modality (SEE section XX below on course approval process).

- *Online*: A course that is using Canvas as the Learning Management System (LMS) and in which 100% of the instruction and interaction between instructor and student is done online. Proctored exams still allowed for this classification, they do not have to be done at any of the YCCD Colleges or sites but must be made available to students at no cost to the student. Should a student prefer a method or place for which there is a cost, the student will be responsible. Instructor regular effective contact is required (SEE section XX below), the course must be approved by the established methods of each College CC as well as the appropriate divisional dean with consultation with faculty.
- *Hybrid course* - A Hybrid course for instructional purposes is defined as any course that replaces anything less than 100% regular face-to-face seat time with distance learning. The distance-learning portion of the hybrid course must provide for instructor regular effective contact (SEE Section XX below). The hybrid course requires separate approval of both the CC and the DEC
- *Web Enhanced*: A face-to-face course that does not replace any face-to-face seat time but requires access to web-based tools.
- *Broadcasted Education*: One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices. NOTE, at this time this is not listed in the AP..WE need guidance on this....

## B. Regular Effective Contact

Course evaluation will be done to assure the faculty who has developed the course has explained “regular effective contact”. The OEI rubric Section B: Interaction and Collaboration will be used to determine the effectiveness of the course design and instructor communication plan.

As per Title V, section 55211(a), all distance learning courses, whether hybrid or fully online will include “regular effective contact” which Woodland Community College defines to include each of the following:

### B.1 Definitions

- *Instructor-Student Interaction:* Instructors will regularly initiate weekly interaction with students to determine whether they are accessing, comprehending, and participating in course activities. This will include multiple methods of feedback including but not limited to discussion, announcements, email, chat, and assignments.
- *Student-Student Interaction:* Evidenced by students working on group assignments, or within a discussion or chat session.
- *Student-Material Interaction:* Evidenced by students working with *instructor developed* course material. Publisher developed material may be used to supplement the course, but cannot be used to define regular effective contact.
- *Other Considerations:*
  - Since distance learning courses are considered the electronic equivalent of face-to-face courses, the frequency of the contact will be at least the same as would occur in a comparable face-to-face course.
  - At a minimum, the number of instructor contact hours per week normally available to face-to-face students will also be available, in synchronous or asynchronous mode, to distance learning students.

### B.2 Contact Expectations

- The instructor’s specific policies regarding the frequency and timeliness of instructor initiated contact and feedback will be part of the syllabus or other course documents made available to students at the start of the course.
- Instructor absences—If an illness, family emergency, or other unexpected reason prevents the instructor from continuing regular contact, the instructor or department will inform students within the course when regular contact is likely to resume. In the event of prolonged absence, the instructor will make appropriate arrangements for class continuation.
- Timely contact—Online instructors are responsible to respond to students in a timely fashion. This is to be defined in the course syllabus

## C. Online Course Development:

The steps necessary to develop a fully online or hybrid course and to secure all necessary approvals are given below. Faculty interested in development of DE courses will be provide a copy of the OEI rubric as a guide to assure compliancy.

#### C.1 Definition:

Substantially Complete - Courses presented to the Distance Education Committee must be “substantially complete.” A “substantially complete” course is one that could be taught effectively without any further additions and throughout the entire term. (Further additions may be welcome enrichments but are not essential.) “Taught effectively” implies that the course already includes all needed elements for effective student-instructor and student-student interactions and also includes required accommodations for disabled students.

- The course will be evaluated using the OEI Rubric and all sections of the course have met the following Criteria. NOTE: Discipline Content is not evaluated by the DEC, only the course structure.
  - Course Design
  - Interaction and Collaboration
  - Assessment
  - Leaner Support

C.2 Department/division consultations and approval: A new online course will have an impact on department/division offerings, staffing, and long term goals. If there is no formal department, then the division alone must approve of the course.

C. 3 Curriculum committee approval: The YC Curriculum Committee requires a completed DE addendum that accompanies the course outline of record on CurricUnet. The DE Addendum (SEE: Appendix XXX) is available for faculty to provide information and justification of the online course format. Submission and approval of the Curriculum Committee's DE Addendum is NOT the same as approval of your course by the DEC. The DEC is simply one step in the approval process before the Curriculum Committee reviews this course for approval.

C4. Faculty Course Submission to DEC: Once the course has been deemed Substantially Complete (generally one-third of the course has been developed), the faculty who has developed the course will contact the Chair of the DEC and provide them with a method for the DEC members to review the course.

C5. DEC Course Review and Evaluation: The DEC evaluation members will review the course using the OEI Rubric and the Course Design Rubric for the Online Education Initiative Course Scoring Rubric (See APPENDIX XX).

- The developer should be prepared to answer detailed questions, such as;  
, how your course will ensure instructor-student and student-student interaction (as mandated by the Education Code) and how your course design will minimize the likelihood of cheating.

C6. DEC will provide the developer with the results of their findings.

- If the course meets standards, the course is ready to be published. The developer will be expected to complete the course using the same standards of the portion of the course that was reviewed. The scheduling dean will be notified the course has been approved to be published and the developer may teach this published course. This approval does not imply the generic course has been approved, only that course by that developer.
- If the course does not meet standards the developer will be provide with recommendations to address the areas not compliant. When the developer is ready for resubmission, it is their responsibility to inform the DOC.

C7. DEC will maintain a list of approved courses by discipline with review dates. The courses will be reviewed every XXX years??? And placed on a recurrent evaluation list. Need help on this one.

D. New Course Approval:

- A new course is defined as one that has not previously been developed as a DE course, or one that has not been taught as a DE course for four (4) semesters or more.
- These courses may NOT be published until they have been approved by the DEC.

E. Current Course Approval:

- Those courses that have been offered using the DE format must still be approved by the DEC.
- The DEC will request a list from the scheduling Deans of the courses and the names of the faculty teaching the courses.
- Faculty will be provided with a copy of the OEI rubric and training upon request.
- DEC will develop a schedule for evaluation of these courses.
- When all current courses have been evaluated and approved, they will be placed on the recurrent evaluation process list.

F. Course Standards:

- Any course developed as a discipline course (one that could be taught by multiple faculty members), it will be approved as a Department Course and any faculty who meets the approval process may teach the course.
- Any course developed within a discipline that is not considered a “discipline course”, must be approved individually as developed by individual faculty.

G. Intellectual Property Rights Agreement:

A Woodland Community College Intellectual Property Rights Agreement will be agreed upon and is in effect (once it is passed by WCC DEC and WCC Curriculum Committee). This Agreement is attached as Appendix X.

#### **IV. Faculty Approval Process**

A. Required: Appropriate training of individual faculty for the distance education modality will be required before an individual faculty member teaches in that modality. The faculty member **must meet a minimum of 1 of the following criteria (a, b, c):**

- Have previously taught using a distance education modality and their course meets the OEI rubric with a passing score.
- Have completed a local DE training program or institute or equivalent that did not focus solely on the technical aspect of teaching online, but addressed also andragogic aspects of teaching online (SEE IV below)
- Have completed a CCC Chancellor's office-sponsored training course (e.g. @One) or equivalent.

B. Recommended: that faculty who teach in the distance education modality would benefit from:

- Having taught the same course in an on-ground/non-DE modality
- Having a mentor—available through the instructional development coordinator
- Having successfully completed (as a student) a distance education course.

C. Process: Proof of meeting section IV.B must be presented to the DEC. The DEC will maintain a current list of approved faculty. This list will be made available to scheduling deans throughout the district.

#### **V. Faculty Training:**

Instructors who are currently teaching online courses also will be required to show evidence of online teaching certification or a course may be submitted for OIE rubric approval.

- There will be a 1-year extension for instructors currently teaching without certification or course approval. If they are non compliant, they will no longer be able to teach their online course.

A. YCCD Training: Includes the following on-campus/online workshops which can be accessed from the YCCD eLearning website [de.yccd.edu](http://de.yccd.edu):

- Faculty Orientation
- Canvas Instructor Guide
- Canvas Designer Guide
- Get to know Canvas (webinar)
- Webinar Archives



- The Canvas Community (forums)
- View & Sign up for trainings at [Flex Website](#)

B. External Training: Online Teaching Certification or any comparable (as determined by the DEC) course is acceptable.

C. Professional Development: It is recommended that faculty should seek continued education in distance teaching and learning certification.

## **VI. Course Scheduling**

Since the print deadline may be far in advance of the completion of training and course development, the DEC will approve the scheduling of courses in a timely manner. Faculty must recognize that if training and/or course development are not completed by the appropriate deadlines prior to finalizing the schedule, the course will be removed from the schedule.

### **VII: Action Process:**

After approval from your department faculty and scheduling dean to offer a course in the DE formation, start the official course approval process by submitting your course for review

1. Request a course shell from eLearning [de.yccd.edu](mailto:de.yccd.edu)
2. Develop your course and meet the "substantially complete" standards as explained in Section C.1 above.
3. When the course is ready for DEC review, request a course shell from YCCD IT. Upload your course into the shell.
4. Inform the DEC your course is ready for review, they will ask to be given access by YCCD IT.
5. The DEC will review the course based on OEI Rubric.
6. The DEC Chair will send you a copy of the report and provide further instructions on additions or modifications needed to bring the course into compliance with the rubric.
7. If in view of the Chair substantial changes are needed, DEC consideration of the course will be removed from the upcoming agenda and you will need to begin the course review process from scratch (with submission of a new Online/Hybrid Course Review Request) once the course has been modified. NOTE: THE course MAY NOT be taught until it is approved. Such a delay in approval may mean the course cannot be taught the following semester.
8. If the course is approved, it may be taught.

## **VIII. Attendance Policy Specific To Online Courses**

**A. Participation required:** Consistent participation is necessary if a student is to succeed in an online course. That means keeping up with assignments from week to week. If a student does not participate, or shows an unacceptable level of participation as determined by the instructor, the student can be dropped from the course. This may affect a student's participation in extracurricular activities, access to various student service programs and eligibility for financial aid. The syllabus for an online course provides the instructor's procedures regarding attendance and participation.

**B. Attendance:** (a) A student must access his/her online course within the first day of class or he/she can be dropped as a "no show." This policy is reflected in the

course schedules. (b) Regular and effective participation is the only means to document attendance in an online course. If a student fails to participate in a regular and effective manner, as determined by the instructor, the student will be dropped for nonattendance during the first two weeks of regular term courses in order to accommodate others seeking to add. An instructor may also choose to drop a student by the end of the eighth week due to lack of participation.

APPENDIX JULIE these are not in the appropriate order at this time,,, they need to be organized as they are listed in the content.. I can fix this later.

## INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

Intellectual Property Rights Agreement MOU

Page 1

### **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

The following memorializes the understanding of the Yuba Community College District (hereinafter referred to as "District") and the Woodland Community College Faculty Association (hereinafter referred to as "YCFA") to pilot the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)

Agreement for the term of the contract, July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017, at which time it will sunset. The Intellectual Property Rights Agreement will be reviewed during the negotiating process for the following YCFA 3-year contract. Modifications to the IPR Agreement, if any, will be agreed upon by March 2017 prior to ratification of the 2017-20 contract.

#### **A. Mission and Purpose**

In the interest of academic freedom, the District values and protects intellectual property rights. In keeping with our vision statement, "\*\*\*INSERT HERE," the District promotes collaboration and the sharing of original works among its faculty.

The District and all employees have a mutual interest in establishing an environment that fosters and encourages the creativity of faculty members. The purpose of this agreement is to establish ownership of creative products of faculty members when District resources are used.

#### **B. Definitions**

1. "Works" means any material that is eligible for copyright protection including but not limited to books, articles, dramatic and musical compositions, poetry, instructional materials (e.g. syllabi, lectures, student exercises, multimedia programs, and tests), fictional and non-fictional narratives, analyses (e.g. scientific, logical, opinion or criticism), works of art and design, photographs, films, video and audio recordings, computer software, architectural and engineering drawings, and choreography.
2. "District Support" includes the use of district funds, personnel, facilities, equipment, materials, or technology. District Support may be either Nominal or Substantial, or a combination thereof.

a. "Nominal District Resources" include those that are customarily available or provided in the course of the faculty member's usual appointment or assignment, such as but not limited to the following: support services provided by other employees, standard indirect costs, the use of computers, photocopy machines, office supplies, the use of an assigned office and telephone, library services, software, multi-media equipment, learning management system for delivery of online learning, compensation for any required training, and performance capture equipment available for use by any faculty member. A budget which is customarily provided for the faculty member's usual appointment or assignment shall be considered a Nominal District Resource.

b. "Substantial District Resources" shall be direct costs to the District and include the provision of a budget over and above any budget customarily provided for the faculty member's usual appointment or assignment. The assignment by the District of other employees to provide secretarial, technical, or creative services specifically for the creation of the Work shall be considered Substantial District Resources. Expensive or substantial District equipment, facilities, and/or other resources (professional recording and filming studios, professional television cameras, etc.) are Substantial District Resources. Reassigned time or stipends allocated for the creation of specific Works are Substantial District Resource; such specific Works include the creation and delivery of new online courses.

### **C. Policy**

1. Copyrights for Works created by a faculty member using Nominal District Resources will be owned by the faculty member. This is the case even if those Works are created in connection with courses taught or other duties performed as a faculty member while employed by the District unless an alternative agreement has been specified under the terms of an Intellectual Property Rights Agreement Form between the District and faculty member (see Appendix A). Such Works cannot be used by the District or any District employee other than the faculty member unless the faculty member has specifically consented to this in the Agreement Form.

2. Copyrights for Works by a faculty member created under a contract which specifically identifies such Works as being "for hire" shall be the property of the District unless an alternative agreement has been specified under the terms of an Intellectual Property Rights Agreement Form between the District and faculty member (see Appendix A). Such Works cannot be used by the faculty member unless the District has consented to this in the Agreement Form.

3. Copyrights for Works created by a faculty member using Substantial District Resources shall belong both to the District and faculty member. All royalties or profits are to be divided as provided in the Intellectual Property Rights Agreement Form to be signed before the project is begun (see Appendix A). Any use by either the District or the faculty member of pertinent Works must be permitted by the terms of the Agreement Form.

4. If the Work in question is the creation of a new online course by the faculty member receiving Substantial District Resources, both the District and the faculty member are automatically restricted in their use of such course for an initial two-year period. During this two-year period, the District agrees that no other District employee will use the course. During this same period, the faculty member agrees that he/she will not use the course in any manner other than within his/her District employment. Any exception to this automatic two-year restriction by either party must be documented in an Intellectual Property Rights Agreement Form.

### **D. Dispute Resolution**

Disputes between a faculty member and the District concerning this Agreement shall be resolved pursuant to the grievance procedures contained in the district's agreements

with YCFA but with one exception to those procedures: should an arbitrator be necessary, the arbitrator chosen by the parties should be an expert in copyright law. If the parties are unable to agree on an arbitrator, one should be chosen in accordance with the commercial arbitration rules of the American Arbitration Association. The District and the faculty member's Association shall share equally in the payment for the services and expenses of the arbitrator. Arbitration is advisory and not binding. (Current grievance procedures are specified in the BCEA agreement under Article X and in the PFA agreement under Article IX.)

**Woodland Community College District; Woodland Community College Intellectual Property Rights Agreement Form**

This work is titled:

It is proposed by:

The description of this work is as follows:

Is this a work created by a faculty member using Nominal District Resources, a work done "for hire," or a work created by a faculty member using Substantial District Resources?

If there is an expectation for the contribution of Substantial Resources from the District?

If yes, describe:

What is the expected faculty contribution and compensation?

Ownership of copyrights and royalties to the product shall be % faculty member and % District. Usage allowed of this work is as indicated in the District/YCFA Intellectual Property Rights Policy unless different usage or competition policy is specified here:

Ten working days prior to signing by the faculty member and District, this agreement will be shared with the faculty member's representative union. YCFA also recommend that the faculty member personally review this agreement form with a union representative prior to signing. As stated in the Intellectual Property Rights Agreement between the District and the Associations, if the Work in question is the creation of a new online course by the faculty member, both the District and the faculty member are automatically restricted in their use of such course for an initial two-year period. During this two-year period, the District agrees that no other District employee will use the course. During this same period, the faculty member agrees that he/she will not use the course in any manner other than within his/her District employment. Any exception to this automatic two-year restriction by either party must be documented in this Agreement Form.

Faculty Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

District Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix C Course Design Rubric for the OEI

**Course Design Rubric for the Online Education Initiative**

In order for a course to be offered as a part of the Online Education Initiative (OEI), it must meet established standards relating to course design, instruction, and accessibility that are intended to promote a quality learning environment that conforms to existing

regulations. Prior to the submission of a course for OEI consideration, it is helpful for the faculty member to review these guidelines and conduct a self-evaluation. The outcome of this self-evaluation is a component of the OEI Course Application process.

The Course Design Rubric for the Online Education Initiative consists of four components:

Course Design  
Interaction and Collaboration  
Assessment  
Learner Support

This rubric is designed to inform the work of reviewers for courses being taught in connection with the California Community College Online Education Initiative. It is informed by the National Standards for Quality Online Courses by the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL). After an initial round of course reviews, the lead review team met with faculty at the OEI Professional Development summit and discussed the strengths and weakness of the rubric. The lead review team then provided recommendations to the OEI Steering Committee and Executive Team for revising the rubric language and structure to enhance the review process.

Revisions approved by the Online Education Initiative Steering Committee for use during the OEI pilot on March 18, 2015.

For each sub-category (within the main categories of Course Design, Interaction and Collaboration, Assessment, and Learner Support), peer online course reviewers will assign a numeric score (from 0-6) for each sub-category within the major categories. The numeric scores align with the levels of mastery as follows:

Distinguished to Exemplary (5-6)  
Satisfactory to Accomplished (3-4)  
Promising (2)  
Incomplete (1)  
Not Evident (0)

It is common for a course to vary in its level of accomplishment across all items within a single sub-category. For example a course might be very strong in "Content Presentation: Navigation is intuitive" but somewhat less strong in "Content Presentation: Content is presented using a variety of appropriate mechanisms," both within the same sub-category of "Content Presentation." In these cases, the higher score (6 for Exemplary and 4 for Accomplished) should be reserved for courses that are strong across all items in the sub-category. The lower scores (5 for Distinguished and 3 for Satisfactory) should be used in cases where most, but not all, of the items in the sub-category are strong.

For a course to be approved for delivery as part of the OEI the following criteria must be met:

A minimum score of 3 (Satisfactory) in each sub-category, requiring at least some sub-categories to score in the accomplished to distinguished ranges  
A minimum cumulative score of 51, earning at least 70% of all possible points

Inclusion of a component with content related to the Online Education Initiative  
The instructional design team will help a candidate course meet the requirements for accessibility, the OEI component, and other instructional design issues as we can. A course that does not achieve the stated minimum scores will not be offered as part of the OEI.

Creative Commons License

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).  
Based on a work at blackboard.com/ecp.

Subpages (4): A. Course Design B. Interaction and Collaboration C. Assessment D. Learner Support

## APPENDIX

DE Addendum

Distance Education: Instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by distance and interact through the assistance of communication technology (§ 55200)

### **General Information:**

Have all faculty in the department been notified of the requirements of this course?

Yes

No

If no, explain

What is the rationale for teaching this course via distance learning? Consider the pedagogical, practical, and technical benefits. (75 words or less)

What are the anticipated challenges with teaching this course via distance learning? Consider the pedagogical, practical, and technical challenges. (75 words or less)

### **Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**

Distance education courses, resources and materials must be designed and delivered in such a way that the level of communication and course-taking experience is the same for students with or without disabilities.

\*Note: The pass/fail criteria is an interpretation of Section 508 web standards, not the official Section 508 documentation.

**Section 508 Checklist for HTML**

508 STANDARDS Requirement/Purpose	Yes	No	Explain
1. Provide a text equivalent for all non-text elements such as images, animations, applets, object, audio/video files, and ASCII art. <i>This will enable a screen reader to read the text equivalent.</i>			
2. Provide descriptions for important graphics if they are not fully described through alternative text or in the documents' content. <i>The description would inform a sight-impaired student of what a picture represented.</i>			
3. Ensure that information conveyed by the use of color is also understandable without color. <i>For example, a sight-impaired or color-blind student could understand a color-coded representation of DNA.</i>			
4. If you are using either more than one language or words which are "imported" from another language (such as faux pas), ensure that any changes in language be identified by using the HTML "lang" attribute. <i>This enables Braille translation software to generate the correct characters (such as accented characters) and speech synthesizers that "speak" multiple languages to generate the proper pronunciation.</i>			
5. Provide textual equivalents to audio information (captioning). <i>The text will enable hearing-impaired students to know what others are hearing.</i>			
6. Provide an alternative audio description for multimedia presentations. <i>The sound will enable sight-impaired students to know what others are seeing.</i>			
7. Avoid flickering the screen and ensure that moving, blinking, scrolling, or auto-updating objects or pages may be paused or frozen. <i>The movement can be distracting for students with certain disabilities.</i>			
8. Enable activation of page elements via keyboard or voice input, not just a pointing device (mouse). <i>This provides students with mouse-dexterity problems an alternative to interact.</i>			
9. Identify, by labeling or other appropriate means, row and column headers. <i>The</i>			

<i>identification will enable screen readers to discern the headers, which disclose the purpose of the data in the rows and columns.</i>			
10. Provide title frames and include sufficient information as to their purpose and relationship to each other. <i>This will help sight-impaired students understand the organizational purpose of the frame.</i>			
11. Ensure (test) the usability of pages, and provide the Curriculum Committee with an evaluation printout from the DE committee.			

**This course maybe offered as:**

- Streaming Video
- Online: A course that uses web-based tools and in which 100% of the instruction and interaction between instructor and student is done online (proctored exams are allowed for this classification. Approximate dates and times should be noted in the Class Schedule.)
- Hybrid: A course that replaces some, but not all, face-to-face class time with web-based tools . (Ask Nili)

**Example:**

Based upon the units of this course and the normal number of meeting that would be scheduled if an on campus course, the amount of replaced time will be established as

- Less than 1/3 the normal scheduled time
- Between 1/3 and 2/3s of the normal scheduled time
- Less that full-time but more than 2/3s
- YES THIS NEEDS TO BE WORK ON**

The date and times of the meetings must be included in the Class Schedule

Specify the rationale / purpose of these on-campus / face-to-face meetings below.

- Factual / Objective tests (student-initiated, and instructor-approved off-campus proctoring option is mandatory)
- Field trip / visit / event (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Hands-on labs
- Participant observation (describe):
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

It is understood the syllabus will be developed to describe the course, the SLO's, types of assessments, methods of faculty and student initiated contact.

- Yes



## **Communication Methods:**

***Instructor Initiated Contact:*** Each section of the course that is delivered through distance education will include regular, effective contact between instructor and students (§ 55204). The use of the term “regular, effective contact” in this context suggests that students should have frequent opportunities to interact with the instructor of record.

***Frequency:*** DE courses are considered the equivalent to face-to-face courses. Therefore, the frequency of the contact will be at least the same as would be established in a regular, face-to-face course. Contact shall be distributed in a manner that will ensure that regular contact is maintained over the course of a week and should occur, at the very least, the same number of instructor contact hours per week that would be available for face-to-face students. (Reference AP 4105)

Check box to acknowledge reading of this paragraph [  ]

NOTE: Some methods are mandatory and you must provide the estimated frequency. Those not mandatory you will have choice to use them or not, but if chosen you must provide the estimated frequency

Video Streaming – Before we can do a dropdown we need to determine what we mean by this..if we continue as we are doing,,, we do have the live video so this really can be a f2f class..BUT do we need to do different requirements for those who do not show up.

## **Online (The following are all under online drop down)**

**Individual Contact with Students via e-mail or phone:** There may be times when the instructor needs to contact individual students. These contacts might be for the purposes of checking the status of the student in the institution, reminding the student of responsibilities, or asking the student questions about the material.

Frequency:

Daily M-F [  ]

Weekly [  ]

Periodically [  ]

**Leading Threaded Discussions:** Leading a threaded discussion is initiated by the instructor and more directly moderated, directing the messages in the threads toward specific subject matter of the class with the individual students in the class.

Frequency:

Daily M-F [  ]

Weekly [  ]

Periodically [  ]

**Announcements:** These are posts that update students on the content or the processes of the class. They can be in written, audio, or video format.

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]

Periodically [ ]

**At least one (1) of the following must be used. Checking the boxes does NOT mean you will have to use them.**

**Timely Feedback on Student Work:** Instructors are responsible for verifying the participation of students and giving them feedback on their performance on assignments. This type of contact is effective and substantive because it provides opportunities for students to adjust their performance and their understanding (or misunderstanding) of the material. As in a face-to-face class, this contact is crucial to the learning process. The timing of this feedback is at the discretion of the instructor, and it depends on the type of learning being achieved, but timely appropriate feedback is essential. Computer-generated exams typically provide immediate feedback, but feedback on written work takes time. Students should be made aware of the parameters of the feedback, which can consist of written, audio, or video material.

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]

Periodically [ ]

Which of the following will be used:

- RUBRIC TO BE USED
- WRITTEN COMMENTS PER ASSIGNMENT
- INDIVIDUAL QUIZ FEEDBACK
- GROUP ASSIGNMENT AND/OR QUIZ FEEDBACK

**Creating and Moderating Virtual Small Groups:** These groups are created and the instructor moderates the work and the discussions among students. Usually there are time limits and deadlines for group work, so the presence of the instructor should be timely and regular within those time constraints.

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]

Periodically [ ]

**Posting Prepared Instructional Material:** In a face-to-face class, much of the contact between instructors and students consists of the instructor presenting material to the class in the form of lectures and handouts or other instructor-prepared materials. In an online class, this is also a mode of effective contact between the instructor and the student. The timing of posting these materials depends on the schedule of the course and should be regular within the parameters of the rhythm of the course.

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]

Periodically [ ]

**Facilitating Student-to-Student Contact.** This contact can be synchronous or asynchronous, face-to-face or mediated through technology, individual or group, and highly moderated or lightly moderated. In this case, instead of the regular effective contact occurring between instructor and student it involves interaction between learners. As with face-to-face classes, this type of communication is very effective in providing opportunities for collaborative learning among students. The timing of this interaction depends on the schedule of the course and should be regular within the parameters of the rhythm of the course.

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]

Periodically [ ]

**Office hours** – Are beneficial for the students. Maybe be done using a Chat feature (in the LMS, Skype, etc.)

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]  
Periodically [ ]

If yes, please note which of the following will be used.

- Virtual
- In person

**Surveys** - are effective to gain real time feedback to assess students' needs and/or understanding of the course, material, etc.

[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]  
Weekly [ ]  
Periodically [ ]

**Student Initiated Contact:** Methods by which students will communicate with the instructor. Which of the following will be opened for students to use.

Announcements

[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

Email within the LMS

[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

Email personal

[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

**Hybrid (The following are under the hybrid drop down menu):**

**Individual Contact with Students via e-mail or phone:** There may be times when the instructor needs to contact individual students. These contacts might be for the purposes of checking the status of the student in the institution, reminding the student of responsibilities, or asking the student questions about the material.

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]  
Weekly [ ]  
Periodically [ ]

**Leading Threaded Discussions:** Leading a threaded discussion is initiated by the instructor and more directly moderated, directing the messages in the threads toward specific subject matter of the class with the individual students in the class.

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]

Periodically [ ]

**Announcements:** These are posts that update students on the content or the processes of the class. They can be in written, audio, or video format.

Frequency:

Daily M-F [ ]

Weekly [ ]

Periodically [ ]

**At least one (1) of the following must be used. Checking the boxes does NOT mean you will have to use them.**

**Timely Feedback on Student Work:** Instructors are responsible for verifying the participation of students and giving them feedback on their performance on assignments. This type of contact is effective and substantive because it provides opportunities for students to adjust their performance and their understanding (or misunderstanding) of the material. As in a face-to-face class, this contact is crucial to the learning process. The timing of this feedback is at the discretion of the instructor, and it depends on the type of learning being achieved, but timely appropriate feedback is essential. Computer-generated exams typically provide immediate feedback, but feedback on written work takes time. Students should be made aware of the parameters of the feedback, which can consist of written, audio, or video material.

Which of the following will be used?

RUBRIC TO BE USED

WRITTEN COMMENTS PER ASSIGNMENT

INDIVIDUAL QUIZ FEEDBACK

GROUP ASSIGNMENT AND/OR QUIZ FEEDBACK

**Creating and Moderating Virtual Small Groups:** These groups are created and the instructor moderates the work and the discussions among students. Usually there are

time limits and deadlines for group work, so the presence of the instructor should be timely and regular within those time constraints.

Yes

Frequency:

Daily M-F

Weekly

Periodically

No

**Posting Prepared Instructional Material:** In a face-to-face class, much of the contact between instructors and students consists of the instructor presenting material to the class in the form of lectures and handouts or other instructor-prepared materials. In an online class, this is also a mode of effective contact between the instructor and the student. The timing of posting these materials depends on the schedule of the course and should be regular within the parameters of the rhythm of the course.

Yes

Frequency:

Daily M-F

Weekly

Periodically

No

**Facilitating Student-to-Student Contact.** This contact can be synchronous or asynchronous, face-to-face or mediated through technology, individual or group, and highly moderated or lightly moderated. In this case, instead of the regular effective contact occurring between instructor and student it involves interaction between learners. As with face-to-face classes, this type of communication is very effective in providing opportunities for collaborative learning among students. The timing of this interaction depends on the schedule of the course and should be regular within the parameters of the rhythm of the course.

Yes

Frequency:

Daily M-F

Weekly

Periodically

No

**Office hours** – Are beneficial for the students. Maybe be done using a Chat feature (in the LMS, Skype, etc.)

- Yes
- No

Frequency:

- Daily M-F
- Weekly
- Periodically

If yes, please note with of the following will be used.

- Virtual
- In person

**Surveys** - are effective to gain real time feedback to assess students' needs and/or understanding of the course, material, etc.

- Yes
- No

Frequency:

- Daily M-F
- Weekly
- Periodically

**Student Initiated Contact:** Methods by which students will communicate with the instructor. Which of the following will be opened for students to use.

Announcements

- Yes
- No

Email within the LMS

- Yes
- No

Email personal

- Yes
- No

## Course Design Rubric for the Online Education Initiative Course Scoring Rubric

Objective	Score (6-0)	Discussion/Suggestions
<b>Section A: Course Design</b>		

A.1 Objectives		
A.2 Content Presentation		
A.3 Learner Engagement		
<b>Section B: Interaction and Collaboration</b>		
B.1 Communication Strategies		
B.2 Development of Learning Community		
B.3 Interaction Logistics		
<b>Section C: Assessment</b>		
C.1 Expectations		
C.2 Assessment Design		
<b>Section D: Learner Support</b>		
D.1 Supplemental Software		
D.2 Course/ Institutional Policies & Support		
D.3 Technical Accessibility		
D.4 Accommodations for Disabilities		
<b>Total Points</b>		
<b>Overall Assessment</b>		





**Draft Data Inquiry Group Charge Statement**

**Background**

Effective colleges consider making change at the design level rather than “nibbling” around organizational edges. An effective college having established a culture of inquiry recognize that their work does not end with a few lasting improvements. They know that improving teaching and learning is an intentional and ongoing process. These colleges find that questions lead to action and action leads to new questions. This ongoing cycle of inquiry establishes a more thoughtful approach to improving teaching and learning schoolwide. Adapted from: Sharon F. Rallis and Margaret M. MacMullen, “Inquiry-Minded Schools: Opening Doors for Accountability” (Kappan, June 2000).

Effective colleges exhibit an ability to:

**Develop Actionable Data** by applying evaluation and assessment techniques, practices, and models that are grounded in good assessment principles and result in evidence that is used to help students succeed.

**Interpret Data through Discussion** by using research evidence and assessment data in meaningful and thoughtful discussions that leads to a wider variety of improved program interventions and classroom teaching and learning strategies.

**Facilitate Dialogue** by employing facilitation skills in discussions of institutional research and assessment with an increased number of participants from all college constituency groups.

**Integrate Data into Institutional Processes** by creating integrated planning strategies that are equity focused and have well-defined links to budget and other core decision-making processes.

**Build an Inquiry-Based Practice** by developing an infrastructure for a culture of evidence that promotes thoughtful, evidence-based collaborative inquiry as a normal, ongoing activity.

Adapted from June 15, 2010 Bridging Research Information & Culture, [www.rpgroup.org](http://www.rpgroup.org)

Possible long-term products by “Data Inquiry Group (DIG)” liaisons, guided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (Dr. Martinez), may be:

**Professional development** at the institution-wide level.

**Data sets** by discipline or support program aligned with program and institutional learning outcomes.

**College governance redesign** reflecting effective data inquiry and application.

**Work Group**

2-3 Faculty and Dean of Student Success, VP, President, District CTO

**Charge**

Deliverable: follow the BRIC model using the five critical components listed below to create a “special assignment” posting for 2-3 faculty members with interest in data-informed decision-making. The final posting should reflect the ability to research and define for WCC by June 2016:

**Processes and procedures** (the how to) components providing guidelines and structures that lend themselves to a cohesive process for facilitating the use of data



**Your College, Your Future · Tu Colegio, Tu Futuro**

	<p>and information aligned with the Completion by Design methodology.</p> <p><b>Research Agenda</b> component providing a way in which to organize data and information so that our College measures its priorities and strategic goals or initiatives aligned with the College’s Completion by Design methodology.</p> <p><b>Action Research Approach</b> describing a method of research, evaluation, and assessment that allows for thoughtful, reflective, and collaborative ways in which to perform the tasks necessary for developing research questions, analyzing data, and turning data into action.</p> <p><b>Information Sharing and Data Facilitation</b> component suggesting essential structures for building a culture of evidence and inquiry and offers some strategies for sharing information and for facilitating data-driven discussions.</p> <p><b>Outcomes Reporting</b> focusing on closing and expanding the information loop by offering ways to report on action resulting from the effective interpretation and application of data.</p>
<b>Report</b>	To President’s Office
<b>Resources</b>	<p><b>BRIC Technical Assistance Program</b>  <a href="http://www.gccd.edu/research-planning/documents/bric/BRIC%20Inquiry%20Guide%20for%20Info%20Capacity.pdf">http://www.gccd.edu/research-planning/documents/bric/BRIC%20Inquiry%20Guide%20for%20Info%20Capacity.pdf</a></p> <p><b>PowerPoint summary of the above</b>  <a href="http://rpgroup.org/system/files/POWERPOINT%20-%20A%20Model%20for%20Building%20Information%20Capacity%20and%20Promoting%20a%20Culture%20of%20Inquiry_0.pdf">http://rpgroup.org/system/files/POWERPOINT%20-%20A%20Model%20for%20Building%20Information%20Capacity%20and%20Promoting%20a%20Culture%20of%20Inquiry_0.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Understanding the Student Experience through the Loss/Momentum Framework</b>  <a href="http://www.inquiry2improvement.com/attachments/article/12/CbD-Understanding.pdf">http://www.inquiry2improvement.com/attachments/article/12/CbD-Understanding.pdf</a></p> <p><b>CbD Principles of Redesign</b>  <a href="http://rpgroup.org/sites/default/files/CbD-Principles.pdf">http://rpgroup.org/sites/default/files/CbD-Principles.pdf</a></p>

**48<sup>th</sup> SPRING SESSION RESOLUTIONS  
FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
April 1 – April 2, 2016**

*Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at the Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session held April 21 – 23, 2016.*

Resolutions Committee 2015-2016

John Stankas, Executive Committee, Chair  
Julie Adams, ASCCC, Executive Director  
Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College, Area A  
Randy Beach, Southwestern College, Area D  
Rochelle Olive, College of Alameda, Area B  
Michelle Sampat, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

## RESOLUTIONS PROCESS OVERVIEW

In order to assure that deliberations are organized, effective, and meaningful, the Academic Senate uses the following resolution procedure:

- Pre-session resolutions are developed by the Executive Committee (through its committees) and submitted to the Pre-Session Area Meetings for review.
- Amendments and new pre-session resolutions are generated in the Area Meetings.
- The Resolutions Committee meets to review all pre-session resolutions and combine, re-word, append, or render moot these resolutions as necessary.
- Members of the Senate meet during the session in topic breakouts and give thoughtful consideration to the need for new resolutions and/or amendments.
- After all Session presentations are finished each day, members meet during the resolution breakouts to discuss the need for new resolutions and/or amendments. Each resolution or amendment must be submitted to the Resolutions Chair before the posted deadlines each day. There are also Area meetings at the Session for discussing, writing, or amending resolutions.
- New resolutions submitted on the second day of session are held to the next session unless the resolution is declared urgent by the Executive Committee.
- The Resolutions Committee meets again to review all resolutions and amendments and to combine, re-word, append, or render moot the resolutions as necessary.
- The resolutions are debated and voted upon in the general sessions on the last day of the Plenary Session.

Prior to plenary session, it is each attendee's responsibility to read the following documents:

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities
- Plenary Session Resolution Procedures
- Resolution Writing and General Advice

New delegates are strongly encouraged to attend the New Delegate Orientation on Thursday morning prior to the first breakout session

## Table of Contents

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolution Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

Consent calendar resolutions in the packet are marked with a \*

- 1.01 S16 Mentoring Programs for Part-Time Faculty
- 3.01 S16 Diversifying Faculty to Enhance Student Success
- 7.01 S16 Costs Associated with Prior Military Experience Credit
- 9.01 S16 Adopt the Paper Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates
- 9.02 S16 Develop a Paper on Effective Practices for Educational Program Development
- 9.03 S16 Criteria for Recording Low-Unit Certificates on Student Transcripts
- 9.04 S16 Flexibility in Awarding Unit Credit for Cooperative Work Experience
- 9.05 S16 Modify Regulations on Certificates of Achievement for Greater Access to Federal Financial Aid
- 9.06 S16 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter
- 9.07 S16 Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for Credit Courses
- 10.01 S16 Adopt the Paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications
- 11.01 S16 Update the 2008 Technology Paper
- 18.01 S16 Develop Retesting Guidelines for the Common Assessment
- 19.01 S16 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators

Table of Contents

**1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE..... 1**  
    \***1.01 S16 Mentoring Programs for Part-Time Faculty..... 1**

**3.0 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/CULTURAL DIVERSITY..... 1**  
    \***3.01 S16 Diversifying Faculty to Enhance Student Success..... 1**

**7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE ..... 2**  
    \***7.01 S16 Costs Associated with Prior Military Experience Credit ..... 2**

**9.01 CURRICULUM..... 3**  
    \***9.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates* ..... 3**  
    \***9.02 S16 Develop a Paper on Effective Practices for Educational Program .Development 3**  
    \***9.03 S16 Criteria for Recording Low-Unit Certificates on Student Transcripts ..... 4**  
    \***9.04 S16 Flexibility in Awarding Unit Credit for Cooperative Work Experience ..... 5**  
    \***9.05 S16 Modify Regulations on Certificates of Achievement for Greater Access to Federal Financial Aid ..... 5**  
    \***9.06 S16 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter ..... 6**  
    \***9.07 S16 Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for ..... Credit Courses..... 7**

**10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST ..... 7**  
    \***10.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications* ..... 7**

**11.0 TECHNOLOGY..... 7**  
    \***11.01 S16 Update the 2008 Technology Paper..... 7**

**18.0 MATRICULATION ..... 8**  
    \***18.01 S16 Develop Retesting Guidelines for the Common Assessment..... 8**

**19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ..... 9**  
    \***19.01 S16 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators..... 9**

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

### 1.0

### ACADEMIC SENATE

#### **\*1.01 S16 Mentoring Programs for Part-Time Faculty**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has long-standing positions<sup>1</sup> in support of the creation of local faculty mentoring programs as stated in resolution 9.06 F90, which calls for local senates to create mentoring programs for all new full-time and part-time faculty members, and 12.07 F92, which calls for local senates to encourage departments and divisions to assist in providing mentoring services to new part-time faculty;

Whereas, The provision of formal mentoring services for new full-time faculty is a common practice in the California community colleges, but little is known about what mentoring services, formal or informal, are provided to part-time faculty; and

Whereas, Local senates are experiencing increased workloads related to basic skills, student success, and student equity and therefore need assistance and resources in not only developing but also implementing and sustaining mentoring programs for part-time faculty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research effective practices for developing, implementing, and sustaining mentoring programs for part-time faculty and report its findings by Spring 2017; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create resources for developing, implementing, and sustaining mentoring programs for part-time faculty.

Contact: Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Mt. San Jacinto College, Part-Time Task Force

### **3.0**

### **AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

#### **\*3.01 S16 Diversifying Faculty to Enhance Student Success**

Whereas, Studies have indicated that a more diverse faculty workforce can enhance student success and may help to close achievement gaps for underrepresented students by as much as 20% to 50%<sup>2</sup>;

Whereas, Since the publication of the Academic Senate Paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures* in Fall 2000, the ASCCC has passed 15 resolutions reaffirming positions that express the need for and value of faculty diversity, yet a great disparity between the faculty diversity and the diversity of the student population remains, as approximately 70% of faculty in the system are white while nearly 70% of the students are non-white<sup>3</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see resolution 9.06 F90 (<http://asccc.org/resolutions/faculty-mentoring>) and resolution 12.07 F92 (<http://asccc.org/resolutions/part-time-faculty-mentoring>).

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, "To Be Young, Gifted, and Black, It Helps to Have a Black Teacher" at <http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/01/20/463190789/to-be-young-gifted-and-black-it-helps-to-have-a-black-teacher>" and Fairlie, R. W., Hoffman, F., Oreopoulos, P. (2014). *A Community College Instructor Like Me: Race and Ethnicity Interactions in the Classroom*. *American Economic Review*, 104(8): 2567-2591.

<sup>3</sup> CCCC Equity Summit Presentation, Irvine, CA November 4, 2015.

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, Education Code Section 87100 (a) (3) cites the need for a “work force that is continually responsive to the needs of a diverse student population,” and hiring practices that promote the development of a workforce better able to serve student needs can work to reduce biases in hiring processes and combat the persistent perception that initiatives to promote the hiring of ethnic minorities compromise professional and academic standards; and

Whereas, Practices that promote the recruitment and hiring of faculty who can serve the needs of diverse student populations will ultimately lead to a more diverse faculty workforce by focusing on and identifying candidates that can best understand, communicate with, and advocate for diverse student populations, thus increasing both faculty diversity and student success;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide rigorous and easily accessible training to educate colleges and faculty on ways in which they can increase the ethnic diversity of faculty through multiple targeted actions to recruit and hire faculty who are best able to serve the needs of diverse student populations while in no way compromising the professionalism nor standards of academic programs; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop guidelines for local academic senates to work jointly with collective bargaining agents, EEO Officers, and Human Resources Offices in order to ensure hiring practices reflect the urgency for developing a work force responsive to the needs of diverse student populations and to correct misperceptions about obstacles to promoting faculty diversity.

Contact: Adrienne Foster (EEO ASCCC Representative) and Cleavon Smith (Equity and Diversity Action Committee), Executive Committee

### **7.0**

### **CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE**

#### **\*7.01 S16 Costs Associated with Prior Military Experience Credit**

Whereas, AB 2462 (Block, 2012) calls for “the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, using common course descriptors and pertinent recommendations of the American Council on Education, [to] determine for which courses credit should be awarded for prior military experience”; and

Whereas, Responsibility for determining credit for prior learning, using mechanisms like credit by exam, relies on input and evaluation by faculty in the disciplines for which credit is being sought and is an academic and professional matter;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in conjunction with the Chancellor’s Office and other system partners, research the costs of implementation of credit for prior military experience; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in conjunction with the Chancellor’s Office and other system partners, work to secure sufficient and ongoing funding to cover the costs for colleges to ensure the timely implementation and ongoing awarding of credit for prior military experience.



## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Contact: Erik Shearer, Napa College, SACC Chair

### 9.01 CURRICULUM

#### **\*9.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates***

Whereas, Resolution 9.01 S15 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “develop a paper on effective practices for local curriculum approval and present it to the field for adoption at the Fall 2016 Plenary Session”;

Whereas, The recommendations of the Strong Workforce Task Force have resulted in renewed focus on the effectiveness on local curriculum approval processes; and

Whereas, The timely adoption and revision of curriculum requires effective faculty-driven curriculum approval processes through local academic senates and curriculum committees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates* and disseminate the paper to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee, Curriculum Committee

See Appendix A - Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates

#### **\*9.02 S16 Develop a Paper on Effective Practices for Educational Program Development**

Whereas, “Educational program development,” which is an academic and professional matter identified in Title 5 §53200, involves the development of all certificates and degrees and is therefore inherently a curricular matter;

Whereas, The Strong Workforce Task Force<sup>4</sup> has identified several recommendations that have resulted in a focus on the development of educational programs, including the following:

- Evaluate, strengthen, and revise the curriculum development process to ensure alignment from education to employment.
- Evaluate, revise, and resource the local, regional, and statewide CTE curriculum approval process to ensure timely, responsive, and streamlined curriculum approval.
- Improve program review, evaluation, and revision processes to ensure program relevance to students, business, and industry as reflected in labor market data.
- Develop robust connections between community colleges, business and industry representatives, labor and other regional workforce development partners to

---

<sup>4</sup> The report of the Strong Workforce Task Force is available at <http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/StrongWorkforce/ReportRecommendations.aspx>

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

align college programs with regional and industry needs and provide support for CTE programs; and

Whereas, Faculty and colleges would benefit from a paper specifically dedicated to effective practices for developing and revising educational programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a paper on effective practices for developing and revising educational programs and bring the paper to the Spring 2017 Plenary Session for approval.

Contact: Diana Hurlbut, Irvine Valley College, Curriculum Committee

### **\*9.03 S16 Criteria for Recording Low-Unit Certificates on Student Transcripts**

Whereas, Title 5 §55070 states that certificate programs of 18 or more semester units require Chancellor's Office approval and must be designated "certificates of achievement" and also allows colleges the option of seeking Chancellor's Office approval and certificate of achievement designation for certificate programs of greater than 12 semester units but less than 18 semester units, with Chancellor's Office approval required in order for the certificates to be listed on student transcripts;

Whereas, Title 5 contains no provision for Chancellor's Office approval of certificates of less than 12 units (often referred to as low-unit certificates), and therefore certificates of less than 12 semester units cannot be recorded on student transcripts even though they may be of value to students and may meet the needs of the community and industry partners;

Whereas, In January 2016 the Chancellor's Office provided the following voluntarily reported data on the award of low-unit certificates to the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum:

- During the period 2010-2015, a total of 77,836 certificates of less than 18 units and not approved by the Chancellor's Office were awarded to students without being recorded on their transcripts
- Of these 77,836 certificates awarded to students but not listed on their transcripts, 56,787 were certificates between 6 and 18 semester units and 21,049 were certificates of less than 6 semester units; and

Whereas, The Strong Workforce Task Force recommendations include a recommendation to "(e)xpand the definition of student success to better address workforce training outcomes for both 'completers' (students who attain certificates, including low-unit certificates, defined as fewer than 12 units; degrees; transfer-readiness; or enrollment in four-year institutions) and 'skills builders' (workers who are maintaining and adding to skill sets required for ongoing employment and career advancement)," a recommendation that clearly recognizes the value of certificates of less than 12 units to industry partners and to the students who earn them;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners to identify criteria and any regulatory changes needed to allow colleges to record the completion of all certificates on student transcripts; and

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates and curriculum committees to review their certificates of greater than 12 semester units but less than 18 semester units that have not been submitted to the Chancellor's Office and evaluate the efficacy of submitting such certificates to the Chancellor's Office for approval, thus allowing such certificates to be recorded on student transcripts, as a potential benefit to its students.

Contact: Michael Heumann, Imperial Valley College, Curriculum Committee

### **\*9.04 S16 Flexibility in Awarding Unit Credit for Cooperative Work Experience**

Whereas, Cooperative work experience education, as defined in Title 5 §55252, allows students to earn college credit while gaining work experience either related or not related to their educational goals;

Whereas, Title 5 §55256.5 states that the course credit for cooperative work experience is granted according to the following formula:

- (1) Each 75 hours of paid work equals one semester credit or 50 hours equals one quarter credit.
- (2) Each 60 hours of non-paid work equals one semester credit or 40 hours equals one quarter credit.

Whereas, Title 5 §55002.5 allows increments of 0.5 units or less if local policy permits, but §55256.5 is ambiguous on the allowance of increments of less than one unit for cooperative work experience; and

Whereas, The consensus of the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum is that colleges should be allowed to offer credit for cooperative work experience in increments of less than one unit in order to provide flexibility to colleges in their efforts to develop cooperative work experience programs that meet the specific needs of their students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners to revise Title 5 §55256.5 to allow greater flexibility in awarding unit credit, including credit in increments of less than one unit, for cooperative work experience.

Contact: Toni Parsons, San Diego Mesa College, Curriculum Committee

### **\*9.05 S16 Modify Regulations on Certificates of Achievement for Greater Access to Federal Financial Aid**

Whereas, Title 5 §55070(a) defines a Certificate of Achievement as "Any sequence of courses consisting of 18 or more semester units or 27 or more quarter units of degree-applicable credit coursework," and these certificates must be submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval and are included on a student's transcript upon completion;

Whereas, Any state-approved educational program that consists of at least 16 semester units or 24 quarter units is eligible for federal financial aid;

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, Colleges are not required to seek Chancellor's Office approval for certificate programs that are less than 18 semester units or 27 quarter units; and

Whereas, Local decisions to not seek Chancellor's Office approval for certificates that are at least 16 semester units and less than 18 semester (or at least 24 quarter units and at least 27 quarter units) effectively block access to federal financial aid for students who complete such certificate programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to modify Title 5 §55070(a) to require all certificate programs consisting of 16 or more semester units (or 24 or more quarter units) be

submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval in order to maximize student access to federal financial aid; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to review and consider for submission to the Chancellor's Office any existing local certificates that are at least 16 semester units and less than 18 units (or at least 24 quarter units and at least 27 quarter units) to more immediately expand student access to federal financial aid.

Contact: Tiffany Tran, Irvine Valley College, Curriculum Committee

### **\*9.06 S16 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter**

Whereas, The ASCCC paper "Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment," approved by the body in Fall 2010 states, "SLOs are instruments of curriculum development, and therefore both the design and the assessment of SLOs clearly are curricular matters";

Whereas, Outcomes assessment is a form of research that may inform improvements in course curriculum, program curriculum and teaching methodologies with the goal of improving student achievement; and

Whereas, Curriculum is an academic and professional matter;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to ensure that institutional decisions regarding student learning outcomes assessment are understood to be a curricular matter and therefore institutions should rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the local senates; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senate leaders to advocate for outcomes assessment as a form of academic research that emphasizes improvement in student learning over compliance with accreditation standards.

Contact: Stephanie Curry, Reedley College, Accreditation Committee

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

### **\*9.07 S16 Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for Credit Courses**

Whereas, Recent legislative action to equalize the apportionment funding rate for career development and college preparation noncredit instruction with that of credit instruction may make the use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses an attractive option for colleges that are developing alternative curricular pathways designed to prepare students for college-level work;

Whereas, Because students are not awarded units for completing noncredit courses, the potential benefits to students of the use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses include no registration fees, no effect on registration priority, and no effect on financial aid eligibility; and

Whereas, Title 5 §§55002 and 55003 are silent on the use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses, and no existing professional guidance from the Academic Senate has been created to assist faculty in the effective use of noncredit prerequisite and co-requisite courses to adequately prepare students for the target credit courses;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop guidelines on the appropriate use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses that ensure the quality and rigor of the curriculum, and distribute the guidelines to the field by spring 2017.

Contact: Michael Heumann, Imperial Valley College, Curriculum Committee

### **10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

#### **\*10.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications***

Whereas, Questions regarding equivalence to faculty minimum qualifications and equivalency processes have been raised with increasing frequency in recent years, especially due to the 2015 discussions of the Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy; and

Whereas, Resolution 10.01 F14 directed the ASCCC to revise its 2006 paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications*;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the proposed revisions to the paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications*.

Contact: John Stankas, Executive Committee, Standards and Practices Committee Chair

See Appendix B – Equivalency Paper

### **11.0 TECHNOLOGY**

#### **\*11.01 S16 Update the 2008 Technology Paper**

Whereas, The creation of educational programs, including professional development, technology, and curriculum standards, is an area of faculty primacy regardless of modality, and an increasing number of colleges are creating or expanding online programs in response to student interest in online courses, degrees, and certificates;

Whereas, In order to be effective in serving students, high quality online educational programs require sufficient resources, including infrastructure, technology, professional

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

development resources, and student support services, all of which are needs that may be identified through local program review processes, institutional planning and budget development processes, and faculty development processes, each of which is a matter of local senate purview;

Whereas, Since the publication of the Academic Senate paper *Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates* in 2008, substantial advances in online education have occurred in the areas of technology, pedagogy, and student support services, including those promoted through the efforts of the California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the legal representative of faculty on academic and professional matters and therefore has primacy in providing professional guidance to the field on the elements of high quality online education programs, including curriculum, student support service needs, infrastructure, technology, and faculty professional development;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in order to provide guidance to local senates and colleges on best practices in online education programs, update the 2008 paper *Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates*;

Contact: Dolores Davison, Executive Committee, Online Committee

### 18.0

### MATRICULATION

#### **\*18.01 S16 Develop Retesting Guidelines for the Common Assessment**

Whereas, Title 5 §55522 (b) specifies that “Each community college district shall adopt procedures that are clearly communicated to students, regarding the college's sample test preparation, how the student test results will be used to inform placement decisions, and the district's limits on the student's ability to re-test”;

Whereas, Existing district policies often permit students to retake an assessment test after some period of time, but that period of time can vary greatly from one district to another, with some districts allowing students to reassess immediately while other districts require students to wait several years; and

Whereas, The Common Assessment will ensure that all community college students are assessed using the same assessment exam, and variances between district policies could create equity issues for students that do not have access to a district with a less restrictive retesting policy;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to develop guidelines for the development of assessment policies that maintain local control over retesting policies and procedures while maximizing access for students and distribute the guidelines to local senates and curriculum committees prior to the availability of the Common Assessment to all colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to wait to revise existing current policies until after the distribution of assessment retesting guidelines.

## 2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Contact: Craig Rutan, Executive Committee, Co-chair Common Assessment Initiative

### 19.0

### PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

#### **\*19.01 S16 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators**

Whereas, The College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015 (AB 798 Bonilla, 2015), provides incentives to colleges that seek to reduce textbook costs by adopting Open Educational Resources (OER) in a minimum of 10 course sections;

Whereas, The intersegmental California Open Educational Resources Council (COERC) created a Request for Proposals (RFP) that included the specific requirement that colleges include in the RFP the “Identification, roles, and responsibilities of your Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator who will coordinating your textbook affordability program, including ensuring the programs are implementing in a timely and effective manner and providing reports and evaluations on the campus’s program outcomes”; and

Whereas, The evaluation of program outcomes regarding curricular decisions, including the adoption of textbooks, is an academic and professional matter;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates that choose to participate in the Textbook Affordability Act to be responsible for the selection of the Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Executive Committee, COERC Member