Los Rios Community College District
District Academic Senate
2017-2018

DAS President........Carlos López
ARC President........Gary Aguilar
CRC President........Shannon Mills
FLC President ....Paula Haug
SCC President ....Troy Myers

District Office
Main Conference Room
Tuesday, February 6, 2018
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Approved Minutes

Roster			
Carlos Lopez	FLC	DAS President	X
Dan Crump	ARC	DAS Secretary	X
Gary Aguilar	ARC	AS President	X
Alisa Shubb	ARC	AS Vice President	X
Janay Lovering	ARC	AS Secretary	X
Tony Giusti	ARC	AS Past President	Excused
Shannon Mills	CRC	AS President	X
Constance Carter	CRC	AS Vice President	X
Donnisha Lugo	CRC	AS Secretary	X
Julie Oliver	CRC	AS Past President	X
Paula Haug	FLC	AS President	X
Tina Royer	FLC	AS Vice President	X
Francis Fletcher	FLC	AS Secretary	X
Troy Myers	SCC	AS President	X
Steve Cirrone	SCC	AS Vice President	
Gayle Pitman	SCC	AS Secretary	X
Ginni May	SCC	AS Past President	X
Dyan Pease	SCC	District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC)	X

Alice Dieli	SCC	District Educational Technology Committee (DETC)	X
Judy Mays	ARC	District Matriculation & Student Success Committee (DMSSC)	Excused
KC Boylan	FLC	Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers (LRCFT)	X
Antonio Lopez	SCC	Faculty, Librarian	X
Ryan Cox	DO	Associate Vice Chancellor, Human Resources	X

Preliminaries
1. Call to Order at 3:05pm
- Introduction of Guests---Antonio Lopez
- Approval of the Agenda---approved.
- Announcements---There will be OER/Textbook Affordability Conference at SCC, March 2, 10:00-2:00. It is meant to be faculty-focused, on OER (open educational resources) low cost materials, with speakers from OpenStax (David Harris, LibreText (Delmar Larsen), CSU Affordable Learning Solutions (Leslie Kennedy)
- Approval of the Minutes (December 5)---approved.
- Public Comment

Information Items
1. SB 1359 (Zero Cost Textbooks) at LRCCD update (Lopez)
Lopez has asked JP Sherry, LRCCD General Counsel, whether it is legal to change a course section from no-cost if there is a change in instructor. It was noted that the current Los Rios FAQ for SB 1359 states that all possible efforts will be made to have the section remain a no-cost section.

2. Districtwide Convocation Recap and next steps
It was noted that Chancellor King expressed his interest in more frequent districtwide convocations and asked for suggestions on frequency. It was also noted we need to pay more attention to sustainability and zero-waste goals as so much "stuff" was not properly disposed in the recyclable and compostable bins available.

3. DAS representatives/ BOT president meeting recap
The senate presidents had the opportunity to meet with Chancellor King and Pamela Haynes, president of the LRCCD Board of Trustees. They noted there are many important pieces of upcoming legislation, including the proposed fully online college and guided pathways. Haynes and King noted that they are not going to publicly oppose what the state CCC Chancellor and Board of Governors support. King noted that "by doing so, you burn political capital" and he gave the example of the ASCCC opposition to AB 705. One of the responses was that "by burning political capital, you lose local capital." There was agreement for senate presidents to meet with the chancellor and board president once or twice a semester.

Decision Items
1. Edits to the Program Placement Council (PPC) Guidelines (Lopez)

It was noted that the language with the edits is not in the body of the Guidelines sent out to DAS members. Lopez gave verbal description of language to allow a department to remove a program from the PPC list. (also see Attachment D).

Motion: to accept the recommendation of DCCC

M/S/C

Discussion Items

1. AB 705 Implementation Support and Coordination Team (Lopez)
Lopez is only member from DAS on the Team which is co-chaired by Lopez and Nye.
He noted that there won't be any decisions made by the group. Decisions will be made by the discipline groups and implemented by the Team.
English---GPAs have been decided upon.
Math and Reading still working on measures.

Action:
Lopez to contact Nye regarding reassign time that had been proposed for the leads---four for English and Math, 2 for Reading and ESL.

---

2. Discussion of Course Caps on Course Outline of Record (COR) from DCCC (Shubb, Pease)
It was noted that there were misperceptions and miscommunications about the request from DAS to DCCC. Some of the DCCC members felt that DCCC was being asked to put something in place as opposed to developing criteria for discussion and what ways there might possibly be inclusion of cap size on the COR for pedagogical purposes. Shubb felt it was not clearly conveyed and Pease noted that there was resistance to even developing criteria ("opening up a can of worms") when we aren't even sure if it should be going through. The DAS group (Shubb, Mills, Lawlor, Knudson) and concluded that there are some cases where a course cap could belong in a COR, but were not looking for something that everyone has to do this. But there are opportunities that it could be done. It is also recognized that it has already occurred in some areas. Lopez noted Nye's concerns that such discussion of course caps might be violating parts of the LRCFT contract. He would like to see the same cap for all four colleges, if the instructional processes are alike. He noted that deans and chairs would be in consultation to work on class max.
DAS members were reminded that much of this discussion started when it was reported at DAS that some faculty had indicated pressure to add students about the class size indicated on enrollment reports (i.e. Crystal reports).

3. Hiring Committee Appointments for vacancy created by retirement (Myers)
Cox noted that it is an "unwritten rule" for the screening/interview committees for faculty, classified and administrators not to include the person who is retiring (and thus, creating the vacancy). There is nothing official (i.e. LRCCD Policies and Regulations) prohibiting it, but that it is just district practice. But he also noted that the senate presidents can appoint any faculty member that they deem appropriate.

4. Policy Changes for Supplemental Questions on faculty applications (Haug)
Concerns were raised by the FLC English department when the supplemental questions they presented for a screening/interview committee were not accepted by the District Human Relations. Cox explained that HR was concerned that the supplemental questions were too specific for the application with the potential for

exclusion of potential candidates, and that the questions might be more appropriate as interview questions. He also noted that concerns had been raised about a supplemental question on the application for an English position at ARC. He stated that a law firm with expertise in human resources that he consulted (Liebert, Cassidy & Whitmore) also noted that the supplemental questions were too specific for an initial application. Cox noted that the driving interest of the District "is a broad and inclusive pool."

He noted that HR currently uses four general guidelines for reviewing supplemental questions and that he has also contracted with the firm to develop potential guidelines for supplemental questions.

Cox proposed a temporary solution to the issue---"The option is to move forward with advertising the positions without the supplemental questions. Then, when the positions close and are screened by HR for MQ's, HR will send the initial qualified applicants the supplemental questions with a deadline, and forward those responses to the Dean. If applicants do not complete the supplementals within the given timeline, they will not move forward to screening."

5. LRCCD Technology Accessibility Task Force—Faculty needed (Aguilar)
JP Sherry is the chair. The main focus currently is on the district websites and online courses. It was noted that instructional faculty need to be included. The suggestion for one faculty member from each college, with an interest in the online environment, especially based on courses. Meetings will be once a month.

Action:

College senate presidents to send names to Lopez for appointment.

Lopez reported that District has contracted with CampusWorks to an audit/research of gaps in our online course offerings---"where are we now, and how can we improve." CampusWorks has already talked to faculty, staff, and administrators and would also like to review courses----maybe 40 courses to be proposed from each campus and with 10 from each college to actually be audited.

It was suggested that that access be that of a student view. It was also asked what are the consequences if audit is not met?

Reports
1. Meeting with Chancellor/ Vice Chancellor
Guided Pathways---Rob Johnstone and Kay McClenney will be making another presentation on March 23. Other issues discussed were the PPC, class sizes, and that, in light of AB 705, that curriculum committees will be requested to expedite co-requisites and prerequisites.

2. College Academic Senate President Reports---no reports

3. District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC) (Pease) see Attachment A

4. District Matriculation & Student Success Committee (DM&SSC) (Mays)---see Attachment B

5. District Educational Technology Committee (DETC) (Dieli)---see Attachment C

6. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) (May)
There will be a state Senate legislative hearing on the CCC budget on Thursday, February 8, and all are invited to attend and possibly give testimony.

May also noted that the Area A meeting will be at Merced College on March 23 and that the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session will be April 11-13 in San Mateo.

7. Los Rios College Federation of Teachers (LRCFT) (Boylan)---Boylan noted the email message from LRCFT President Dean Murakami that was sent to all faculty earlier in the day. She also noted LRCFT interest in the state's proposed fully online college, course caps, zero cost textbook (especially change in instructor) and the technology audit.

Future Agenda Items
1. DACA Rapid Response Team Report / Update on requests from La Comunidad
2. Mobile Device Management
3. Professional Development
4. Online Education Initiative (OEI) Exchange Update (Dieli)
5. Update of Research into Noncredit Viability at LRCCD (Crump, May)
6. Policy Changes for Supplemental Questions on faculty applications

Future Events
- **Next DAS meeting – February 6, 3:00-5:00, DO**
- LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, February 7, DO
- ASCCC 2018 Accreditation Institute, February 23-24, Anaheim
- ASCCC Area A Meeting, March 23, Merced College
- ASCCC 2018 Spring Plenary Session, April 12-14, San Mateo Marriott
- ASCCC 2018 CTE Leadership Institute, May 4-5, Southern California
- ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute, June 14-16, Sheraton Park Hotel, Anaheim
- ASCCC Curriculum Institute, July 11-14, Southern California

Adjourned at: 5:01pm

- -

Attachment A:

DCCC Report to the District Academic Senate, February 6, 2018
1. **Curriculum:** All courses and one program deletion on the January 26, 2017 DCCC agenda were approved. New courses and deletions will appear on the February Board of Trustees agenda.
2. **Competency Committees:** The DCCC voted to approve the recommendation from the Reading Competency Committee to deny reading competency for CRC SOC 305 and approve CRC ENGRD 311.
3. **New Designators/Thematic Blocks/Families:** New designator ESLA (ARC) was considered at first reading. The DCCC will vote on this proposal at its next meeting on Friday, February 23, 2018.
4. **Collaboration Requests**: CISS 315 (SCC and ARC) was approved.
5. **SOCRATES Advisory Group (SAG):** There is no report. SAG meets February 5, 2018.
6. **Program Placement Council (PPC) Process:** The process is still in review and has not been finalized.
7. **Class Size Max on the COR:** Alisa Shubb and Shannon Mills represented the DAS with the request that the DCCC develop a set of criteria that could be applied when faculty want to request a class size maximum on the COR. Various members of the DCCC expressed strong concerns. Many on the DCCC feel that this is a union issue and the LRCFT would need to be involved with discussions about adding class size maximums to the COR. Others feel that class size maximums are a scheduling issue between faculty and Deans and, as such, do not belong on the COR. Still others voiced concerns about the process that got us to this point. It seems we have moved from "exploration" of the idea to "implementation" of the idea without a clear set of records showing the

process of decision-making. The DCCC requested further discussion and clarification at the DAS on February 6, 2018.
Respectfully Submitted,
Dyan Pease
DCCC Chair

Attachment B:

District Matriculation & Student Success Committee, Report to District Academic Senate, February 6, 2018

1.   Probation & Dismissal Practices (R-2133) – review of research obtained from college research offices – SCC and FLC provided some data on the number of students identified as probation 1 & 2 and dismissed. It was learned that interventions provided to this population are tracked by the offices providing the services and not the college research office. Thus the data available was very limited. District Administrative Liaison Melanie Dixon will attempt another avenue to obtain better data.

2.   Number of students in each priority registration category and implications for students with courses in progress – The Committee will consider whether it makes sense to create a district wide process to incentivize continued enrollment into a second term in light of AB19 and the implementation of Guided Pathways. Baseline data of the number of students who would be served by such a model is first needed to better inform the discussion.

3.   Other – There was concern expressed by some members of the Committee regarding the committee charge and purpose. Given the recent laws and initiatives which impact how our colleges serve students, questions have been raised regarding the relevancy of the Committee's work. Below is a copy of revisions to the committee's charge submitted and approved by DAS in fall 2016 and submitted to the Chancellor's Executive Council for approval.

1.1   District Matriculation & Student Success Committee (DMSSC)
1.1.1   Purpose: To provide recommendations to the District Academic Senate and advise the Board of Trustees or its representatives on matters related to District-wide issues of Matriculation and Student Success & Support Programs. Title 5 defines core matriculation services as; orientation, assessment and placement, counseling, advising, and other education planning services.
1.1.2   Areas of Responsibility:
1.1.2.1 Recommend policy related to the components of Matriculation and Student Success & Support Program services reflected in Title 5 regulations;
1.1.2.2 Examine those areas of Matriculation and Student Success & Support Program services affecting two (2) or more Colleges and support the effort to work toward consensus;
1.1.2.3 Convene special task forces to address Board Policy pertaining to Matriculation and Student Success & Support Program services; and
1.1.2.4 Develop recommendations related to Matriculation and Student Success & Support Program issues assigned to the committee by the District Academic Senate or by the Board of Trustees or its representatives.

Attachment C:
District Educational Technology Committee Report to the District Academic Senate February 6, 2018

 Notes from the Educational Technology Committee meeting January 25, 2018
Campus IT Updates

☐ARC – none

☐CRC – In a restructuring process, the CRC IT committee will be housed under Instructional Services instead of Resources. CRC is implementing virtual desktops CIS DE classes.

☐FLC – none

☐SCC – Campus upgrades in process.

☐DO IT - D2L is no longer active and Canvas is the district sole CMS (Course Management System). DOIT is working on network improvements including Smart Rows/Data Centers at FLC & DO and a camera update project. ARC will likely be the pilot for the project, with 50/60 cameras to be eventually replaced/installed at each college.

☐It was reported that the AB705 implementation team met recently with March 1st being the target date to get the drop-down menus loaded with the GPAs recommended by the Faculty Discipline Groups. The district team noted that Sierra College and Diablo Valley College have easy sites to navigate.

College LMS/DE Update

☐ARC – The Course Exchange application is in process and being shared with the college faculty through the Academic Senate. The OEI Rubric Academy is in full swing and began during flex week. The Accessible Course Creation Academy begins on February 23rd and is based on the @ONE program. The course is optional and faculty can earn 2.0 units of salary credit. Some of the upcoming workshops include, the new Canvas Gradebook, Proctorio, and GoogleDocs.

☐CRC – The D2L transition to Canvas has been smooth. Faculty are excited by the ability to markup submissions/assignments available in Speedgrader because it was never implemented with TurnItIn. Distance Ed IT Committee is discussing recommending training before faculty can do online teaching and discussing the definition of fully online and partially online. They are very interested in making the class schedule clearer to students.

☐FLC – none

☐SCC – The D2L to Canvas transition is going well. They are working on the OEI self-assessment packet. 590 students completed the SCC version of the OEI Quest modules successfully with help desk supported by student help from Learning Resources, but it may become a collaborate effort with IT and Learning Resources. Long Beach has a good model.

☐DO – The LMS stats show 55,000 students, 1950 faculty, and 3300 courses are now in Canvas. Student orientation was rolled out on January 10th with a goal of no more than two hours from the time a student uploads their application to when they can access the orientation. The faculty evaluation pilot (EvaluationKit) resulted in a 65% student response rate and the LRCFT is looking into extending the pilot into the spring. Training for deans will take place next week and the HR website has information available.

Online/Hybrid Work Group

The faculty workgroup exploring the different definitions for online and hybrid that exist among the campuses updated the committee. The group includes faculty from each of the four colleges. With the help of the district research team, they will be surveying students about what they understand/expect from the terms online and hybrid when they are listed in our class schedule.

ARC's research department will begin designing the survey which will then be brought to the District Research Council. The group is considering the meanings of face-to-face testing and/or orientation and their relationship to district, OEI, Ed Code, Title 5, and IPEDS definitions; the differences and similarities across the district curriculum committees.

SEL/Course Schedule Software Update

It was reported that both work groups finished their work and the Course Schedule Software vendor selected was Ad Astra. It will be a 5-year contract with implementation during the spring and there will be a district-wide implementation team. After going through the RFP process and interviewing vendors, it was decided

that none of the SEL software vendors could provide a tool to meet our needs so that selection process has been put on hold. San Mateo CCD is going through a similar RFP process for the selection of a SEL product and have asked us if we'd like to observe their process and/or provide input.

Office 365 Migration

DOIT has been running a mini pilot for the Office 365 migration. They had originally issued an RFI, but rejected the vendors received in lieu of running the pilot in house. The active directory assessment will kick off soon to look at user groups, provisioning, etc. They hope to expand the pilot group with groups/departments who share information and can join the pilot at the same time. It was noted that some colleges don't give students email accounts while some give students and employees the same accounts. We provide students Gmail, but not employees. There was discussion of whether the students cloud accounts will be segregated from employee accounts. The big driver of getting Office 365 for employees was larger email storage.

Accessibility Task Force Update

CampusWorks is assisting with the task force and conducting an internal district accessibility audit. It was also noted that the reports we received from the State didn't seem to highlight the fact that ARC met the 95% of the goals, but the report made it appear that there was much work to do. Ironically, their own report was not delivered in an accessible format. There is a note at the bottom of the introductory page ii that alternate formats [of the report] are available upon request. The next meeting will be Wednesday, January 31st and board policy and regulations are being generated.

Information Items/Announcements

a. CCC Digital Learning Day –The event will take place on February 22 and a call for proposals has been issued. The colleges will be participating at different levels.

b. Online Teaching Conference – Registration is open and they are accepting proposal submissions.

Future Items

o Accessibility

o Distance Education Virtual Desktops (from ISO Agenda)

The next meeting is scheduled for February 22.

▬ ▬

Attachment D:

Operating Guidelines for the PPC Process
Updated on December 1, 2017, approved by DCCC 12-1-2017
Overview:
The Los Rios Program Placement Council (PPC) process ensures that proposed new degree or certificate programs in the district are vetted thoroughly by vice presidents of instruction, faculty at the department level and faculty represented by the District Academic Senate and District Curriculum Coordinating Committee, and by deans and other administrators. The goal is for transparency of interests—both in identifying potential new programs as they appear on the PPC List and in offering opportunities for feedback about items on the list—before a decision is made by the PPC identifying which college(s) will move forward to develop the programs.

Principles:

1. We affirm a commitment to making sure that our programs are healthy and have the best chances of success.

2. We will make PPC decisions based on how our programs serve the needs of our students and the community.

Considerations Used When Assessing Program Proposals:

1. Unnecessary duplication of a program within the district

2. Employment demand

3. Likelihood of the program to succeed/achieve sustainability

4. Likelihood of the program to have enough completers to meet federal focus on completion and sustain approval for federal financial aid (e.g. Gainful Employment requirements)

5. Existence of a complementary suite of programs at the proposed college site

6. Promotion of comprehensive program offerings at all colleges by ensuring the District's smaller colleges (FLC and CRC) can grow to better serve their communities

7. Likelihood of the development of a comprehensive educational program

8. Cost of the program to implement and maintain

9. Regional need as evidenced in comments by bodies like the NFNRC and/or local needs as evidenced by advisory committees or other similar local information-gathering processes related to program development

10. Availability of appropriate resources that have been approved or planned for as evidenced in a five-year plan or similar planning document: facilities, equipment, FTE, grant funding, etc.

Operational Rules:

Timing, Frequency, and Documentation:

1. The Vice Presidents will gather new program ideas four times during the academic year, in September, November, February, and April. These proposed programs will go forward to the PPC (the four VPIs, the District Academic Senate President, and the District Curriculum Coordinating Committee Chair) for approval.

New Request Due Dates for PPC List	Approval or Referral to for Informational Meeting
1st VPI meeting in September	1st VPI meeting in October
1st VPI meeting in November	1st VPI meeting in December
1st VPI meeting in February	1st VPI meeting in March
1st VPI meeting in April	1st VPI meeting in May

2. The following steps will ensure participation and feedback from all interested parties:

a. Following the submission of new requests, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction will distribute the PPC list with new submissions to the PPC. The VPIs will share the list with deans and department faculty, the DCCC chair will share with college curriculum chairs, and the DAS president will share with college senate presidents.

b. The AVCI will take the PPC lists to the Career Technical Education Leadership group (CTEL) to capture feedback from its members who are regularly involved in planning for district CTE programs.

c. Any concerns brought up at any level (department, curriculum, Senate, administration) should be shared with all members of the PPC.

d. By the first VPI meeting of the month following a new-request due date, the PPC will review the lists from the colleges, highlighting the new potential programs. Via an email correspondence, the PPC will make decisions to approve or defer for an informational meeting.

3. Further inquiries may be necessary to achieve clarity and resolution in respect to individual program proposals and proposals that are closely related or which may benefit from further inter-college dialogue, including the Convergence Process described in #7 below.

4. At the VPI meetings listed above, once feedback has been gathered from all groups listed in #2, proposals will be voted on and approved by the PPC only if they have received no irresolvable concerns by any constituents offering feedback. If such concerns exist, the proposal will go to an informational meeting. Prior to this meeting, the PPC, CTEL, and faculty from the affected college departments will be invited to provide information that they can present to clarify or support their position on the proposed program. Specific information may be requested by the PPC. If this informational meeting leads to agreement and approval, the PPC will vote to approve.

If the informational meeting does not end in agreement, the proposed program will move to the Convergence process (Step 7 below), which will allow further discussion and, if necessary, voting by both administrators and faculty representatives.

Positive results of the PPC process will be recorded on the Recommended to Proceed List, the most recent version of which will be distributed to the DCCC, CTEL (the Career and Technical Education Leadership group), Executive Staff and other groups having interest in the curriculum/ program development process. Approved CTE programs will proceed to the North/Far North Regional Consortium for review and endorsement. In its work reviewing new-to-college courses and programs, the DCCC will be vigilant that the results of the PPC process are reflected in the proposals that are recommended to the Board of Trustees for approval. It will be the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology, working with the Chair of DCCC, to assure that the current PPC Recommended to Proceed List and PPC procedures documents are available to the DCCC and the District Community.

5. Under emergency circumstances, the PPC will consider program placement requests that fall outside the usual timelines for the PPC process, as indicated in #1 above.

6. Proposals for new athletic teams will be sent to the VPIs for discussion of any possible concerns by other colleges. The process to add or delete athletic teams is addressed in P/R 7141. When a team is proposed to be added, DCCC shall be informed, and athletic coordinators will be apprised as well.

<u>Additional Means of Resolution:</u>

7. Convergence Process: in attempting to achieve resolution of possible conflicts, the PPC may agree to use a Convergence Process, wherein the CTEL and faculty meet to attempt to resolve conflicts related to an individual college program proposal or a complex of related proposals that might result in an agreed-upon allocation of program complex emphases or elements across two or more colleges. Minutes will be taken at this meeting.

8. If other means of resolution (further conversation among the VPs or CTEL, the various forms of the Convergences) have failed and a voting process is ultimately required to determine the placement or replication of a program, then the Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology will convene the PPC for the purpose of voting. The PPC will review the proposals under consideration, using the considerations listed in the second section of this document, and vote on the placement or replication proposal. If necessary, the Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology will cast a tie-breaking vote.

9. If any member is not available for one of the voting PPC meetings, then a designee familiar with the instructional issues under discussion will be appointed to appear in his or her place.

10. The proposals voted to be placed or replicated will be added to the appropriate college's section of the Recommended to Proceed List.

<u>Following the "Recommended to Proceed" Listing:</u>

11. If a program is approved for further development by the PPC by a particular college but is not developed or does not show signs of being developed within two years following placement on the Recommended to Proceed List, the program topic will be open to other colleges for consideration. If there is no interest, the program will be removed. In March the PPC will conduct an annual update and review of programs that have been approved in order to assess the status of approved programs. If a program has been on the list for over a year and a half with no indication the college has begun any planning for starting the program, the college's VPI will consult with the appropriate dean and faculty from the college to remind them of the program's inclusion on the list and to inquire as to their plans.