



ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, April 4th, 2019 12:30 p.m. Board Room

ATTENDANCE

Senators

Visitors

- Jerome Evans
- Paul Flor
- Amber Gillis
- Brent Kooiman
- Kent Schwitkis
- Hoa Pham
- Rajinder Sidhu
- Holly Schumacher
- Shirley Thomas
- Nikki Williams
- Mahbub Khan
- Vanessa Haynes
- Jesse Mills
- Pamela Richardson
- Malinni Roeun
- Jose Villalobos
- Jasmine Phillips

- Aurora Cortez- Perez
- Axa Maradiaga
- David McPatchell
- Kendahl Radcliffe
- Judy Crozier

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** – Amber Gillis 12:44 p.m.
- II. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** –Schwitkis/Mills – vote taken and approved
- III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Mills/Schwitkis - vote taken and approved
Approved with addition of Jesse Mills name added to attendance

IV. **REPORTS**

President’s Report- Amber Gillis reporting.

- Tomorrow is the next Making Decisions Document meeting. We will begin drafting. The packet includes a copy of the last minutes. There is a tentative “Table of Contents” included in the packet. Each of the 8 portions of the table of contents has a writing subcommittee that has a list of people that will begin drafting the narrative tomorrow. If you are available, you are more than welcome to come. We may need to meet a few more times because I do not see us writing the entire document tomorrow. We have had about 35 people in attendance at each of the meetings. It has been going very well. I will have more of an update later. Before any document is adopted by the college, it does have to visit all constituent groups so that we can make possible suggestions.
- Consultative Council- We had a food service survey. What we discovered is that there are quite a few students who are not able to have breakfast. This means that students start and sometimes end their day hungry. We asked Bailey Smith to come in and talk about what is going on with Tartar Support and the Food Pantry. There are about 25 regular shoppers to the food pantry. Dr. Curry gave them a budget of \$50,000. They are starting a breakfast pilot. There is a snag to this because

they are not able to serve fresh food. They do not have access to running water in there and they are not food safe certified. They will find out what it will take to get the water up and running. The food safe certification can be done online and only costs about \$15. We were looking at a possible MOU with Every Table but we run into some problems with the food contracts that we currently have on campus. Every Table would like to set up a vending machine for free or very inexpensive food, but we need to work with this because of the vending machine contracts. We need to figure out how to make that work. Dr. Curry was working with Sara Goldberg Rabb on something related to free lunch. We will hear more on this later on.

Vice President- Jesse Mills reporting.

- The SLO team is meeting every week to sort out the timelines for fall 2018 and spring 2019. When everything was migrated from ECC the timelines were not migrated. We will also be working with people in the divisions to make sure that the SLO statements are accurate in TracDat.
- Program Review- We received another 2017 that got final approval so we only have 2 left. The 2018s are already coming in and a couple of them are on the website because they have been approved. We are moving along.

Board Representative – Jerome Evans reporting

- Consultative Council- Steve Haigler presented his budget assumption issues. There is a COLA increase of 3.46% from the state. There will be 1493 sections of classes offered for 2019-2020. We have positions for at least 9 or more full time instructors. Automotive Technology, Articulation Counselor, ESL, 3 Nursing, Psychology, Sociology, 3 Guided Pathways Counselors (total of 8 counselors) and 3 full time managerial positions.

Curriculum: Roza Ekimyan reporting.

- This semester we did our first CORs and added our new courses for Compton. We passed 4 courses. We have 7 new courses coming in. The Curriculum committee will be working over spring break to get these approved. Maya and I are working on sending emails out to originators to work on comments they are receiving from the technical reviews. We passed 3 CORs and 1 new course. We have a couple more coming through the pipeline and I will announce these at the next meeting.

Guided Pathways- Vanessa Haynes reporting.

- I have been reassigned at 100% to complete the maps. One of the things that we are doing is including the descriptions of the meta-majors. I passed out the descriptions of the draft. This came out of the committee and I wanted to present this to Senate to get some feedback. These will be placed on the website as the descriptions. Students will be able to click on the descriptions. This is supposed to be a catchy description that will bring the students into the program. This is a draft and we would ask for any input on this. S. Thomas- I have a suggestion of changing Public Health and Social Services to Health and Public Professions. A. Gillis- I know that Dr. Peju has been talking to Dr. Curry about this. We want to make sure that students are not misled since Social Services can mean social work so we want to make sure students are clear on what they are looking for. Are you asking senate to make some recommendations? Before we take a vote, would you like people to send you the comments? V. Haynes- please send this to Dr. A. You can send these to me and please cc Dr. A. Discussion followed on logistics of sending in comments.

Distance Education- Jasmine Phillips reporting.

- No report

Academic Affairs- Stephanie Atkinson- Alston reporting.

- No report

V. ACTION ITEMS-UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- None

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- BP 1200 Mission, Vision and Strategic Initiatives or 1st read. Loren Sosenko- This past year the California Community College Chancellor's Office put out their new vision for success and part of that vision was a requirement for each district to align our major plans to the vision. Because of this we decided that we needed to update the mission statement. We took recommendations from all stake-holders. The old mission statement used to have the language life-long learning but there is a big emphasis on student completion and employment. What you have today is an edited version. So you can see what has been struck through and added. This is still going through vetting with other constituent groups. [L. Sosenko- read through the mission statement]. Any big questions or concerns? The next section of BP 1200 includes the Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes. We held a summit with multiple stakeholders and the resulting edits include the new institutional set goals. J. Phillips- I have a question on page 12 and what we are measuring. Discussion followed. L. Sosenko- the last part of this board policy has to do with the Strategic Initiatives. The only change was with the language since they are staying the same. Discussion followed. A. Gillis- If you want to provide written feedback, please forward them to me. We will bring this back for a second read.
- Jasmine Phillips- The Distance Education Annual Plan is 26 pages and we are sending it through for a first review. It was asked that we send it through to Academic Senate in order to gain support so that you can make recommendations to the board and president about how to better support Distance Education. There are a lot of goals that came out of the QFE and what I would like to do is go over some of these to let you know where we are in terms of what we have already finished and where we need additional support. QFE Goal 1: Part of that takes 3 different steps. The first one was to have a DEFC to go through training and acquire an understanding of what we need on campus. We have started the DEAC committee to take a look at what other campuses are doing. Everything we included is linked backed to the QFE and our strategic goals and master plan. For DE Goal 1B-We are moving forward with hiring a classified Canvas administrator. Thank you for vouching for that. I think Dr. Curry said that we would have this person in June which is when we need this person up and running. We need to identify another dean who can be in that stead until that person is here. Hopefully we will have this conversation soon. DE Goal 1C- We have the committee established for DEAC. With representation across campus and we are updating our minutes and goals on the website. DE Goal 2A is the handbook and we passed that through Senate, so thank you for your support on that. The next thing that we need to do is we as DEAC will begin documenting the "Best Practices" for faculty in terms of how to use Canvas. Part of the purview of DEAC is to make recommendations of how we use Canvas. We need to start documenting these best practices in DEAC so we need more people to come or if you cannot come then you can make recommendations to your representative so that we can put together a robust list and hopefully have this done by the end of the semester. V. Haynes- Do we have webinars on this? J. Phillips- Every meeting that we have has been recorded and they are all up on the DE Faculty Resources website. We have already established some recommendations for Regular and Effective Contact. Goal 2B- This is in relation to QFE Goal 2 which is to implement best practice to increase online student success. This is where the

POCR training begins. POCR stands for Peer Online Course Review. I don't want to confuse the word review with the already established evaluation process. This is completely different. The POCR review process is outside the contractual duties of faculty and it is a very intense process. 8 faculty members were willing to do this so we trained them in accessibility from the CCC Technology Center and as POCRs from the CVC-OEI. The CVC-OEI has their own process and we have adopted this process because Dr. A stated that she wanted us to adopt their rubric, so we did this. She also stated that she wanted us to review courses based on the rubric, so we are trying to adopt the CVC-OEI process to do this. So if there is any question about where this process came from, it came from the CVC-OEI. [Discussion followed about the implementation of recommendations made by POCRs and differentiating the difference between what the POCR process is for and DEAC]. DEACs role is to provide recommendations on best practices. DE Goal 2C- This relates to best practices. There is a survey that goes out from the state of California. We are to administer it so that we can be part of the statewide process to gain access to information on what DE is doing and how effective it is. There is also regular ongoing trainings that we have structured this semester. There is training on accessibility, the rubric, and best practices and Canvas open lab. We have a couple of trainers in the room. Dr. Schwitkis and Nikki do you have any feedback on the trainings on what faculty have been saying on the trainings and how effective they are? N. Williams- Really one of the things that they are saying is that there are not enough of them. There are so few of us trainers and there is only enough space in our schedules to do so many. We need more in the evening which was the best attended. Faculty that attend are coming again and again because they realize that it is a lot of work. If we want quality classes we need to realize that we need more support with this. Dr. Schwitkis- We need to realize that this going to take a while for all of us to get up to speed. I have had a few open sessions. I worked one-on-one with a person that has not done a shell before so there is a lot of work to do. V. Haynes- Is it possible to have some trainings on webinar? J. Phillips- There are trainings that are provided by Canvas and C3 media. There is no way to provide a recording of trainings that I can give. We have to get there. We are still using outside sources and it makes sense that DE would provide this, however with 6 hours, there is no way that I could provide you with that. DE Goal 2D was adopting Canvas as a course management system. We are underway with that however there is a lot more that needs to happen. We are still working on the basics. If you are thinking that we are going to have the robust Canvas in June, we are not. The robust ecosystem that we are looking for are not going to be there because every additional thing has to be "contractualized" and sent to the board and part of goodies that we all want like the online counseling comes with being part of Consortium which won't happen until fall. A subcommittee of DEAC needs to be formed to make sure that we are following the checklist and self-evaluation to go through all of the documents to formulate the plan through the summer time to make sure that it is implemented in fall. All we will have is Net-tutor. We are looking to continue this work. DE Goal 2E- We adopted the rubric and implemented the rubric. We are getting some hesitation to continue with the POCR process and the rubric. It would be nice if we could get support with moving this forward otherwise we will have to come back to the drawing board with how to review course shells. P. Flor- What is the hesitation? J. Phillips- Everybody agrees that we need to review, it is just the how is what we are having some hesitation on. A. Gillis- I think that it also has to do with compensation. J. Phillips- The Instructional Coordinator in terms of instructional design, the QFE stated that there would be 20% release time for a DE Instructional Coordinator. That came directly from the QFE and that has not happened yet. There has not been any discussion about how this should happen so we are definitely open to and welcome to Academic Senate discussing this and seeing where this 20% should go whether it is a new person or attached to someone who is already

doing something. Whoever wrote the QFE included that and it is definitely part of the structure for success of DE. The QFE stated that we would implement a model course shell program. This is connected to the Instructional Coordinator piece, so without that we will have to pause on having a model course shell program. The third and last goal of the QFE for DE relates to joining the CVC-OEI because they will help with the online counseling including more student resources in Canvas which would also make them available to the whole campus and would support all students. Updating the DE website will happen next semester since we are so busy this semester. We want to create a marketing video. We definitely want to do that, we just do not have time to do this so we will probably move this to next semester. I spoke with Dr. Curry about this. He suggested earmarking \$10,000 to allocate for Heather Parnock to figure out how to best do a marketing video and an orientation video as well. DEAC's role is to provide a recommendation as to what should go in the video. 3C is joining the OEI and we have to sign a Master Consortium Agreement, even financial aid has to sign part of the agreement so that the systems communicate. This is a large process. When you read this for the second time I just want to make sure that everyone is clear with any questions on the goals. P. Flor- I had a question and you brushed over it. A DE Instructional Coordinator was written when we did the QFE which predates a lot of what DEAC has been doing so was there an understanding that this was a 20% release outside of the DEFC? J. Phillips- In the QFE it is written that there is 40% release time for DE. A. Gillis- I wonder if this is a typo, because I don't know if Dr. Curry is seeing it that way. N. Williams- The understanding that DEFC would also be the Instructional Designer as well? P. Flor- Is there a specific description for an Instructional Designer? A. Gillis- I don't think that we have a specific description for this position. J. Phillips- In the QFE it says that DEFC will coordinate DE and the job of the DE Coordinator is to assist faculty with making their course shells and this is two completely different positions. In fact, the real role of DE is a 100% position and could be divvied up to about 4 or 5 different people with percent time to do all of the things that are required to have a successful DE department. In the QFE it was written as 40%. P. Flor- At this institution a decision was made that whenever a position is coordinator it is at 20% release and this is an arbitrary number. If the QFC says 40% and our definition of coordinator says 20% then we have to retitle it. J. Phillips- I agree with you about retitling this. You can spend 20% going to meetings, because remember that you have to run DEAC, go to Senate and Curriculum. You can have 20% to train and teach faculty, and 20% to do instructional design shells that are robust. There is 100% of work to do no matter who is the faculty coordinator. It should be a 100% position. A. Gillis- I am going to ask you, because I wrote the QFE, it just says "recognizing the need for robust instructional support, Compton College will hire a DEFC from the ranks of faculty on reassigned time." There is no mention of 40% release time that I can find. J. Phillips- That one is the faculty coordinator. The words instructional coordinator are in the essay. A. Gillis- So what it says is that the "DEFC will be supported by a DE Instructional Coordinator who currently oversees support for online students." That person is being hired. J. Phillips- The Instructional Coordinator is not classified person; it is a faculty member. A. Gillis- We have not identified them as a faculty member; it just says that they will oversee technical support for online students, but it does not make mention of any percentage related to release time. J. Phillips- I thought that the support for students is the Canvas administrator. What the Instructional Coordinator said in the QFE that it was going to support faculty members to create course shells. Those are two completely different jobs. Those are the positions that are in the QFE. Do we have any more questions on this before I move on? S. Thomas- Since there seems to be some confusion on this with the wording, maybe you can bring this back? J. Phillips- Absolutely, this is first read. One last thing, with the proposed budget that is on page 23, one thing that needs to be proposed before June 30th. We really need to get

support for paying Etudes to maintain our records for 3 years because legally we have to maintain records for 3 years. Right now, their contract is going to end June 30th so we need to pay them to hold our records for 3 years. This is really time sensitive and should go to board approval soon or at least we should have a conversation about this soon.

- PO CR process- The purpose of bringing this forth is to get support or a recommendation from Senate as to how to proceed. The VP of Instruction, the Dean of DE, along with full-time and adjunct faculty agree that a robust review of online courses is essential to the success of Goal 2 of the QFE. We trained 8 faculty members in accessibility and the PO CR process from the CVC-OEI. DEAC approved that this is a recommendation that we want to bring forward to Senate. I want to explain the process because I think that not everyone is aware of what goes into the process. We are in stage 1. We selected the PO CRs and trained them; we matched about 7 people per PO CR and let them know that they would be reviewed. This has all happened already. We did not expect faculty to review all 7 in one semester; they will be reviewing 3 this semester. I have designed all of the consent forms and Gema will be creating Master course shells so that we can make sure that we maintain FERPA compliance. In stage 3 the faculty members copy the course shells and let the PO CR know that they are ready to be reviewed. The PO CR then reviews the course shell via the rubric sections A, B, and C which will be an extensive process. We have said on the conservative end that it will take 10 hours, but I think it will take more for some that are needing a lot of review. The results go into a Google share doc and the faculty member is able to work on their course over the course of semester and summer to come into alignment. Stage 4 can take a semester or two to get everything aligned. In stage 5, this is where the faculty would contact the DEFC to complete the final review. We do not have an accessibility person yet. This is something that we need to figure out. It is too much to ask the PO CRs to review section D. Discussion followed. This is the process that has been adopted state-wide and what faculty are motivated to do. Once a faculty comes into alignment, it is expected that the faculty will implement the process to their other courses. We are not saying that we are going to continuously review faculty. Discussion followed. J. Villalobos- Is the administration going to see this? J. Phillips- An administrator does not see this information until the faculty is aligned. Administrators are not part of the process. Discussion followed. We have postulated 10 hours at your hourly rate to look at the course shell. This is where the push back is coming from. The total cost is \$32,000 because all courses need to be reviewed and is a one-time cost. The cost moving forward will be 0. This is a first read and we need feedback or another recommendation. A. Gillis- Have you heard anything from the visit. J. Phillips- No, I have not. A. Gillis- I know that the slated money from that is \$200,000. Before as a senate, we make a recommendation, we need to see what they say and then we can make a recommendation.

VII. Information- Discussion Items

- A. Gillis- There is flyer in the back for Flex credit. J. Crozier- Come to share your conference information and a quick activity. There will be a link for anyone who wants to present and if you want to attend. It is April 25, 2019 from 12:30-2:30.
- E. French-Preston- I have come to applaud the faculty for the work that you are doing. We currently have 4 honors classes on the schedule this spring semester.

Events/Meetings

-

MOTION TO ADJOURN –Approved – 2:02 p.m.