

Academic Senate Draft Minutes April 22nd, 2024

# 1 The Joint Academic Senate meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m.

# 2 Roll call Cormia (Conducted at MLC)

Officers	Location
Voltaire Villanueva	MLC
Patrick Morriss	Online (w/address)
Ben Kaupp	MLC
Robert Cormia	MLC
Senators by Division	
Apprenticeship	
Stephan Schnell	Absent
BSS	
Brian Evans	MLC
Mona Rawal	MLC
Counseling	
Tracee Cunningham	Online (w/address)
Leticia Serna	Absent
DRC/VRC/SRC	
Ana Maravilla	Online (as guest)
Fine Arts & Communications	
Robert Hartwell	MLC
Kate Jordahl	Proxy (Robert Hartwell)
HSH	
Rachelle Campbell	Online (as guest)
Brenda Hanning	MLC
Kinesiology/Athletics	
Dixie Macias	Online (as guest)
Rita O'Loughlin	Online (address posted)
LA	
Stephanie Chan	Absent
Rocio Giraldez Betron	Absent
LRC	

Destiny Rivera	Online (as guest)
Eric Reed	MLC
STEM	
Sara Cooper	MLC
vacant	
Professional Development Coordinator	
Carolyn Holcroft	Online (address posted)
Faculty Chair of COOL	
Allison Lenkeit Meezan	MLC
Ensuring Learning Coordinator	
Stephanie Chan	
Kerri Ryer	Absent
FA Rep	
Julie Jenkins	MLC
ASFC Rep	
Joshua Agupugo	Absent
Classified Senate Rep	
Adiel Velasquez	Online (as guest)
21-23 P/T Rep	
Roxanne Cnudde	Online (address posted)
22-24 P/T Rep	
Michael Chang	MLC
Advisory Members	
President's Cabinet	
Stacy Gleixner	Online
Dean of Equity	
Ajani Byrd	Absent

**# 3** Adoption of the agenda - agenda was approved by consensus

Erik Woodbury announced that today's discussions would focus on Repetitive Strain Injury (RSI), accessibility issues, and RSI training.

The minutes from the February 26th joint meeting were approved by consensus.

#### # 4 Public comment

Fatima Jinnah shared that Dr. Ahlam Muhtaseb of California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) will be hosting a film screening titled "1948: Creation and Catastrophe." Further details will be distributed via email.

#### # 5 – Presentation of RSI Crosswalk

The presentation detailed the four essential documentation items mandated by AP 4105, which include:

1. Ensuring course compliance with accessibility standards,
2. Providing adequate training for faculty,
3. Developing a plan for Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI),
4. Documenting the training provided.

It was confirmed that training can be conducted in synchronous, asynchronous, or hybrid formats. The discussion then focused on how faculty members can meet the training standards. It was emphasized that Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) involves more than just managing the operations of the Course Management System (CMS).

A question was asked - Who is currently responsible for overseeing the training for online instruction? Are faculty effectively linking course material with student interactions? Furthermore, is there verification that faculty are teaching the content they claim to be teaching?

Sufficient training and support must be provided to faculty. All training should be completed either before starting or within the first two quarters of teaching. While there may be prior training, new faculty may require additional training to meet FHDA-CCD standards, which include familiarity with Canvas and Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) principles. An equivalency review may be conducted to assess whether prior training meets current standards.

Kathy Perino noted that, according to contract terms, faculty members cannot be required to teach online. Therefore, it might be permissible for some faculty to opt out of training for online instruction.

Each course syllabus should specify the mode and frequency of instructor contact. The dean of each department is responsible for collecting either the syllabi that explicitly states Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI), or a separate document affirming RSI for each class.

Alison mentioned that if 75% of a course is conducted face-to-face, RSI training might not be necessary. Eric Reed proposed that all syllabi, regardless of course format, should include a communications statement detailing RSI. Kathy Perino supported the notion that every online course syllabus should feature a comprehensive communications plan.

To ensure that RSI is effectively implemented, evaluations similar to a J1b process will be conducted. This involves peers reviewing each other's courses and providing feedback specifically on the class communication plans designed to facilitate RSI.

Kathy noted that a J1 evaluation constitutes a full course review, in contrast to a simpler evaluation that specifically targets RSI effectiveness. Allison emphasized that the overarching goal of peer evaluations should be "continuous improvement," enhancing the quality and effectiveness of course delivery and interaction.

Sara mentioned that many STEM faculty, due to their extensive experience in online teaching, have expressed a desire to "test out" of further RSI training.

Allison highlighted that some faculty members have not undergone a J1 evaluation in over a decade. She noted that Foothill College was criticized for this lack of ongoing evaluation during the last accreditation visit. Allison mentioned that evaluations should ideally occur on a three-year cycle.

Kathy Perino pointed out that there is a compensation element involved with conducting a full J1B evaluation.

It was noted that faculty members should undergo evaluations every nine quarters, making a three-year cycle for assessing RSI compliance reasonable.

Instructors may choose between an online or in-person class evaluation. However, the specifics of how these evaluations will be conducted are still under negotiation.

Faculty peer reviews of online courses could extend across different divisions or departments, offering numerous benefits.

Robert Cormia shared insights from his experience in the Peer Online Course Review (POCR) program, noting the current absence of a specific rubric for J1B evaluations that includes RSI criteria.

It was emphasized that there is a need to develop a standardized RSI rubric to ensure uniformity in evaluations.

A rubric gives the faculty and the evaluator a means to understand how they will be evaluated. There was a comment that once we bring RSI compliance into the District, there will need to be a managed rollout, as there could be over 1,000 faculty who need evaluation. A rubric provides both faculty and evaluators with a clear understanding of the evaluation criteria, ensuring transparency and consistency in the process.

It was noted that introducing RSI compliance across the District will require a carefully managed rollout, given that over 1,000 faculty members may need to be evaluated. This large-scale implementation underscores the need for structured and phased planning.

It is imperative that each course be made accessible. While online learning inherently aids in accessibility, there is a broader need to ensure that all courses meet accessibility standards.

During the discussion, it was suggested to add the word “student” to slide 13 in the presentation titled “Documentation Items to Receive Online Certification,” to clarify the focus on student needs

#### Documentation Sign-Off Procedures (Slide 14)

For Each Instructor

1. Complete the required training.
2. Obtain sign-off from the Online Learning department.

For RSI and Accessibility Review there are four necessary sign-offs:

1. Training completion.
2. Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI) review.
3. Accessibility review.
4. Inclusion of a statement on RSI and accessibility in the syllabus.

#### Time Commitment for Training and Reviews (Slide 15)

For New Faculty

Initial Training: Each new instructor is required to complete 12-18 hours of instruction.

For Ongoing Training

RSI and Accessibility Review: Continuing faculty must undertake 4 hours of ongoing training, scheduled once every three years.

Popetech was highlighted as useful for facilitating accessibility checks.

Helen Graves encouraged faculty to seek assistance from the Online Learning department for both accessibility issues and effective course design.

Sara requested clarification on the training time required for brand new instructors:

- Approximately 12-18 hours if the instructor has no prior training in Canvas.
- Roughly 6-10 hours if the instructor already has experience with Canvas.
- Ongoing training taking roughly 4 hours would occur every 3 years

It was noted that significant progress has been made in addressing these issues since the last joint Academic Senate meeting.

#### Additional issues (Slide 16)

- Compensation - How are reviewers compensated for time and effort?

- Need to consider enhancing coordination across the District and between colleges for more streamlined processes

Lene noted that many features in Canvas might not fully make sense to instructors until they are actively teaching a class. She emphasized that Online Learning is available to assist during an instructor's initial experiences with teaching using Canvas. This support includes helping instructors understand how Canvas functions in a live instructional environment and providing ongoing instructional support for faculty.

The second bullet point on Slide 16 was amended to read: by the end of the second quarter.

Kathy Perino specified that for instructors who are already teaching online and do not require initial training, the deadline should align with the end of the winter quarter, effectively within two quarters.

Alison emphasized the necessity of having a candid discussion about the resources available and the practicality of managing a rollout within these timelines.

A question raised: Who is responsible for verifying that the training has been completed? This was parked for future discussion.

Sara expressed that the scope of the project—comprising training, evaluations, sign-offs, and potentially establishing a new department—feels "massive."

Alison commented that Foothill College is significantly behind schedule and emphasized that proceeding with these initiatives is not optional. She raised concerns about how these efforts will be resourced, especially in light of discussed budget cuts.

A question was raised about the initiative being an unfunded mandate, leading to concerns about where the necessary resources would come from. Lene suggested that many programs could be developed to aid in student learning, which could potentially justify or attract funding. Robert Cormia mentioned the Professional Growth Award (PGA) as a resource for faculty development. Voltaire highlighted that 60% of the faculty are adjuncts, underscoring the challenge of resource allocation within the faculty body.

It was confirmed that evaluations are required every three years.

A distinction was made between a full J1 evaluation and a separate evaluation specifically for Regular Substantive Interaction (RSI). The need to enhance the rigor of J1 evaluations was discussed.

Allison posed a question about whether the current approach is meant to set a basic minimum standard (a floor) or an aspirational goal (a target). It was noted that J1 evaluations are crucial

for determining faculty assignment privileges. It was further noted that RSI includes anybody that is teaching, including emeritus faculty.

Eric Reed motioned, and Ben Kaupp seconded, to accept the RSI document as amended with the discussed edits.

Lene commented that most districts require online courses to be reviewed before they are taught. She suggested that faculty should seek assistance from instructional designers, emphasizing that there are time and resources available for this purpose.

A question was raised about the possibility of using a portion of Professional Development Leave (PDL) for online training. It was suggested that if an application for PDL is already in progress, modifications should be made to include this training.

The vote to adopt the amended document proceeded without objections and was unanimously approved by consensus.

**# 6** For the good of the order

Eric Woodbury said an email will be coming out.

Announcements: The de Anza student government elections are currently in a runoff. They need 200 votes to meet the minimum vote requirement.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.