ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting | November 5, 2024 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm |
Student Union 214/Zoom Link: https://cccd-edu.zoom.us/j/83950717582

Academic Senator Attendance			
Jason Ball, *Part Time Faculty*	Present	**Kate McCarroll,** *at-Large*	Present
Carol Barnes, *Counseling*	Present	**Irene Naesse,** *at-Large*	Present
Lauren Becker, *at-Large*	Present	**Jeanne Neil,** *Business & Computing*	Absent
Allissa Blystone, *Math & Sciences*	Present	**Leland Paxton,** *Part Time Faculty*	Present
Eric Budwig, *Technology*	Present	**Lori Pullman,** *Curriculum Chair, Parliamentarian*	Present
Jodie Della Marna, *Library*	Present	**Loren Sachs,** *at-Large*	Present
Rendell Drew, *at-Large, President*	Present	**Katherine Sheehan,** *Visual & Performing Arts*	Present
Carly Gonzalez, *at-Large*	Present	**Jordan Stanton,** *Social & Beh. Sciences*	Present
Lee Gordon, *at-Large, Vice President*	Present	**Lily Ei**, *ASOCC Student Representative*	Absent
Marilyn Kennedy, *Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary*	Present	**Vacant,** *at-Large*	Vacant
Jodie Legaspi-Kiaha, *Athletics & Kin*	Present	**Vacant,** *Part Time Faculty*	Vacant
Vesna Marcina, *at-Large*	Present	**Vacant,** *Consumer & Health Science*	Vacant

Please see the Voting Tally Chart after these minutes for individual members' votes.

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In): Rob Schneiderman, Jeanette Grimm, Anna Hanlon, Laura Behr, Chris Kerins, Sheri Sterner, and Tara Giblin.

1. Preliminary Matters

A. <u>Call to Order</u>: **President Drew** called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.

B. <u>Public Comments</u>: Professor Chris Kerins.

C. <u>Approval of the Minutes</u>: *Motion 1: Senator Kennedy moved to approve the October 29, 2024, meeting minutes with minor changes; motion seconded; motion approved.*

D. <u>For the Good of the Order</u>:

Vice-President Gordon: I would like to recap that during the public comment section, we discussed adding the topic of district compliance with shared governance to the agenda. Specific issues were raised, including forced curriculum changes, repeatability, and families of classes.

Senator Kennedy: The hypothesis software, which many in the English department use, is being discontinued. While efforts were made to notify the professors who rely on it, one professor who heavily depends on the software was not informed. This individual, who teaches an intersession class, only learned about the discontinuation through an email, as no communication came from the Dean of Instruction or anyone else. The core concern is not about switching to another tool, but rather that decisions like this are being made without adequate faculty input. There needs to be a process in which faculty drive decisions regarding technological changes, rather than having these decisions imposed without full faculty feedback. This situation seems to reflect a broader issue of top-down decision-making.

2. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. <u>Academic Senate President and Vice President Reports</u>:

President Report – Rendell Drew:

Día de Los Muertos: Today, we are celebrating Día de Los Muertos in the Multicultural Center, with an altar set up for the occasion. The event will run from 11 AM to 4 PM today, and everyone is invited to join. While I am not sure if there will be snacks or refreshments, perhaps Nate Jensen can provide further details. This event is an important cultural observance that honors the lives, deaths, and contributions of individuals, particularly through the creation of an *ofrenda*—an offering with items like photographs, personal mementos, and even symbolic objects like guitars or bottles of tequila for musicians. I encourage you to stop by and experience this tradition, as it is a meaningful way to remember loved ones.

Faculty House: I recently met with Vice President Rick Pagel and Rick Garcia for a walkthrough of the Faculty House. We are moving forward with plans for renovations, including the removal of old carpeting, new drywall, fresh paint, and updates to the kitchenette. These improvements will help create a space for gatherings and refreshments, particularly around the holidays. The goal is to complete the renovations by Fall 2025, although we are hopeful to finish sooner if possible. The project is now in motion and will proceed through the College Council. I also want to remind faculty about the academic rank change process for Fall 2024. Petitions must be submitted by Nov. 25th.

UDoIt: Additionally, I received a request from Vice Chancellor Andreea Saban regarding volunteers to evaluate the UDoIt Advantage and Pope Tech Accessibility Dashboard. If you are interested, please let us know. So far, we have one volunteer from our campus, and other colleges have one or two as well. The goal is to gather 20 volunteers from each college.

Plenary Session, Resolutions, and AI: Next, I will be attending the Academic Senate Plenary Session in Visalia from November 7-9. This year's theme is "Cultivating Student Success through Faculty Engagement, Practice, and Community." There will be breakout sessions on AI in education, academic freedom, and inclusivity, all of which I plan to explore in detail and bring back relevant information for our campus. There'll be conversations around the use of AI. As you are aware, we are seeking to develop a district wide policy and procedures for our college, and we believe that the other two colleges will follow suit. As has been made very clear to us, the District has to first establish a district policy, but I've also communicated and whatever that district policy is that it's going to have to include opportunities for each college to develop their own set of procedures for the utilization of AI in their departments and their divisions. **Senator Kennedy:** I did want to share that faculty are requesting that the college have a stronger, maybe public voice about academic integrity. In other words, the college should focus on that in a positive way, as to how much we value not only the learning process, but academic integrity. There's a sense that there's a silence at the college, and it's probably time for the college to have a dialogue with the Senate.

Great Shake Out: We also participated in the Great Shake Out drill on October 10, which was a successful evaluation of our campus-wide emergency systems, including the Rave emergency notification system. I am working with Jim Rudy and the campus security team to review the results and present them to the Academic Senate soon. Safety is a priority, and I appreciate the efforts of those involved in keeping our campus secure. **Faculty and Colleague of the Year:** Finally, I want to remind you that nominations for Faculty and Colleague of the Year are still open. The deadline is November 14.

Dennis Kelly Celebration of Life: Additionally, there will be a celebration of the life of Dennis Kelly on Saturday, November 9. 2:30 PM, in the OCC Horticulture Garden. Please feel free to wear Hawaiian-themed apparel in honor of Dennis. I want to thank Lee Gordon for taking the lead in organizing this special event. As a final note, as a political science professor, I encourage you to vote today. Regardless of political affiliation, I urge you to choose the candidate who you believe is best for the country at this time.

2. Vice President Lee Gordon: No report.

B. **Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Initiative – Rendell Drew:**

We will move forward with providing a full report on the CRCPI grant that we received last year, likely next week. However, if several people are out of town, it may be the week after. I apologize for the delay in sending out the letter to faculty regarding the second year of the grant. I will ensure that you receive a comprehensive update in the next week or two.

C. **Online Advisory Board (OAB) – Online Coordinator Laura Behr:**

We are committed to full transparency regarding the software we are implementing or discontinuing. If faculty members are interested in introducing new software to campus, they are encouraged to bring it to the OAB for discussion. Afterward, we can bring it to the Senate for further consideration. This applies to any software related to Canvas, accessibility efforts, or tools such as Design Plus. Please feel free to bring your suggestions to the OAB, and we will be happy to discuss them and work toward approval.

D. **Curriculum Committee – Curriculum Chari Lori Pullman:**

While reviewing the catalog, we noticed that it stated students could earn multiple associate degrees, but it did not reflect the option to earn multiple AA degrees. After further review, we believe this is likely a typo that was never corrected. I assume you all would agree with the idea that students should be able to earn multiple AAs if they are eligible to earn multiple degrees at the college.

3. Consent Agenda:

1. **Representative to College Council:** Elizabeth Blake
2. ~~Degree Catalogue Language~~
3. ~~Full Time Faculty Hiring Prioritization~~

President Drew asked for unanimous consent to remove items 2 and 3 from the consent agenda and bring them back next week.

Motion 2: Senator Kennedy moved to approve item number 1 in consent agenda and more items 2 and 3 to next week's agenda; motion seconded; motion approved.

4. Unfinished Business

A. <u>**Regular and Substantive Interactions (RSI) - Laura Behr and Anna Hanlon:**</u>

Anna Hanlon: We want to summarize what we have learned and outline our plan for moving forward. Last week, we had Dan Johnson from Coastline Community College, and then we had a detailed discussion about their approach to documenting and ensuring RSI (Regular and Substantive Interaction) in online courses.

Coastline requires all instructors to create their own RSI plan using a template, which I will show you shortly. These plans are uploaded to Canvas in a designated module. Each

semester, when a course is copied over, instructors review and update their RSI plans as necessary. They then complete a statement confirming the update, which is submitted to their department chair. The department chair ensures that the plans are current, but it is the responsibility of faculty, not administration, to manage this process. This approach emphasizes faculty ownership of the RSI process. The RSI form used by Coastline College is very specific about the types of interactions that must be documented, especially for asynchronous courses.

However, I believe we need to extend this approach to include synchronous courses as well, since the ACCJC includes both asynchronous and synchronous courses in their compliance review. Another key takeaway is that Mount Sac is working diligently to meet compliance requirements. They have created a task force to develop recommendations and have set up a system for faculty to report their RSI activities. Faculty members complete a form that outlines the types of RSI methods they are using and where they can be found. Faculty reviewers then validate this information by checking the course shells. Mount Sac plans to review 450 courses over the next semester or two, and they are hiring two RSI faculty coordinators at 7 LHEs each to support this ongoing process. I just wanted to highlight their form and process, which is relatively straightforward.

Online Coordinator – Laura Behr: We introduced the self-check tool and have received feedback from senators and faculty. The goal is to create a self-check tool that can be uploaded into Canvas, allowing accreditors to easily find the RSI information in an instructor's course. This self-check is intended for individual faculty members who wish to fill it out and upload it to their Canvas shell. It provides a simple way for ACCJC reviewers to quickly locate the RSI details in a course. We plan to propose this self-check tool after the OAB meeting on November 15 and bring it to the Senate for approval on November 19. This tool will not be submitted to anyone else; it is purely for individual use to help reviewers locate RSI in courses.

What is already in place includes Board Policy 4105, which requires syllabi to be made publicly available, and we send them to our deans for review. Additionally, we have the faculty evaluation question #7, which asks if there is regular and substantive interaction in online courses. This is part of the tenure-track faculty evaluations and has been in place for some time. The key questions in the evaluation are:

- Are we conducting RSI regularly?
- Does the instructor respond in a timely manner?
- Is the instructor providing relevant and helpful feedback (the substantive part)?
- How does the instructor effectively communicate with students?

These are all essential components of RSI, and while they may now be emphasized as a buzzword, they have always been part of our teaching practices. Anna and I have already met with most divisions to discuss RSI and the difference between correspondence courses and distance education. Faculty have asked thoughtful questions and are actively engaging with the process. Many instructors are already creating the "dead" module or page in their Canvas courses to help reviewers find the RSI.

Looking ahead, we need to decide on a process. We now know how Mount Sac and Coastline are approaching this, so we need to determine what we want our process to be. We would like to develop a plan that OAB can review, and then bring it forward to the Senate for approval. Our goal is to finalize the process by the next OAB meeting and decide how we want to implement and track RSI moving forward. This will be a collaborative effort among faculty.

President Drew: I suggest bringing it forward on the 19th, after your next OAB meeting. Additionally, it would be helpful if you could send any relevant materials in advance so we can review them before the meeting.

Online Coordinator – Laura Behr: To summarize, we recognize that this process must be faculty-driven. We aim to secure the support of the Senate, and we have already discussed this with CFE President Rob Schneiderman and CFE Executive Director Vesna Marcina, who agrees and will provide their approval. Importantly, we are not asking faculty to do anything additional; these requirements are already outlined in our contract and evaluations. Our proposed course of action is for OAB to bring forward a proposal that strengthens the existing processes. While RSI is included in our evaluations, it is currently unclear, and we aim to clarify and reinforce this requirement in both our distance education guidelines and evaluation procedures. As for the timeline, OAB will meet on November 15, and we will present the proposal for approval on November 19. After approval, we will disseminate the final decision to all faculty.

Motion 3: Vice President Lee Gordon moved to extend this agenda item for additional five minutes; motion seconded; motion approved.

Vice-President Gordon: The question was raised about whether we should model our approach after Mount Sac or Coastline. I believe we should follow Coastline's example. Coastline College has been predominantly focused on distance learning for quite some time, and it is central to their mission, not just a side offering. For this reason, they have made a clear distinction between live Zoom classes and asynchronous courses, and I believe this is the right approach. Live Zoom classes are different from asynchronous courses, and we should treat them as such. I suggest we adopt a similar strategy to Coastline's and keep the process simple. **Anna Hanlon:** I want to clarify that both asynchronous and synchronous distance education are forms of distance education. The key difference is that synchronous courses involve direct interaction between the student and instructor, while asynchronous courses do not. This is simply informational, not a judgment. The ACCJC will be reviewing both types of courses. It is important to note, however, that Coastline does not accredit us. **Senator Becker**: I have a small suggestion. You mentioned that the form would be sent to the chair, but not all of us have a department chair. Some of us have area chairs or program coordinators. It might be helpful to include the language "chair, program coordinator, or program director" to clarify to whom the form should be sent. **Senator Ball**: I have four questions, and perhaps they can be addressed during our next discussion. I will go through them briefly:

1. Part-time faculty are required to complete various trainings and tasks without compensation. Will there be funding available to pay part-time faculty for their participation in this work, or will it become another instance of unpaid labor they must engage in before being compensated for their actual duties?

2. What are the potential consequences if a faculty member does not participate in reporting their anticipated RSIs?

3. What are the potential consequences if a faculty member fails to submit a report on the RSIs for courses they have already taught?

4. What are the potential consequences if a faculty member's course is found to have not met the required standards?

Anna Hanlon: Could you please send us those questions? They are valuable feedback that the OAB should consider as we move forward.

Online Coordinator – Laura Behr: Senator Ball I have discussed with administration the possibility of providing further support, a stipend, or compensation for creating or

uploading RSI documentation into the course shell. There has been some discussion on this matter. **CFE Executive Director Marcina:** I would like to echo Senator Gordon's point about the differences between Coastline and Mount Sac. Coastline's process was developed by faculty to proactively avoid any potential warnings, whereas Mount Sac's process was implemented after they were placed on warning by ACCJC. Mount Sac was given 18 months to address the lack of RSI in their classes, and as a result, their process is more intrusive. It required an MOU between the union and administration, and faculty are being compensated due to this agreement. We are taking these steps to avoid being placed on warning, but I think Senator Ball's question is important: how will we compensate part-time faculty who teach online courses? It would be helpful to know, from the outset, how many of our distance education courses are taught by full-time versus part-time faculty. This will give us a clearer sense of the stipends or support that may be needed to assist part-time faculty in fulfilling these requirements. **Senator Kennedy:** We need to clarify what the term *distance education* truly means. If you are teaching a small synchronous writing class on Zoom, it does not feel like distance; it is more interactive and immediate than what we traditionally think of as distance learning. The concept of *distance* seems to be more about physical space or time separation, and in some cases, we might be measuring things like miles or connectivity rather than engagement or real-time interaction. At the same time, we have faculty expressing concerns about the increased workload associated with these modes of teaching which is a serious concern. **Vice-President Gordon**: I want to highlight a point raised by Senator Marcina, as it reflects a broader tendency in the Senate. Often, we focus on the most extreme examples and treat them as representative of the larger situation. Mount Sac is in a unique position and does not reflect the experience of most colleges. Coastline, on the other hand, represents a more proactive and typical approach. Before considering extreme measures, we should first examine the more mainstream model, such as Coastline's approach.

B. **Board Policies and Administrative Procedures (BPAP) Report: AP 6400 Audits - Marilyn Kennedy:**

AP 2510 Participation in Local Decision Making: This policy covers the 10+1, and there are no significant changes to the policy. The revisions are mainly updates to pronouns and the names of groups, so everything will remain the same.

AP 4030 Academic Freedom: Similarly, this policy has not undergone any substantial changes. I did ask the BPAP committee to ensure that the language in the updated academic freedom policy is consistent with the CFE contract, as that was negotiated carefully. They are currently reviewing it.

AP 5500 Student Code of Conduct: Changes to this policy reflect updates to the Education Code that affect student conduct and accommodation processes. One notable change is that students involved in disciplinary meetings can now bring an advisor of their choice, provided the advisor is trained by the school. The advisor cannot speak or intervene during the meeting, but they may offer support or take notes. This applies to both student conduct hearings and accommodations requests.

I have been in dialogue with our student conduct officers to ensure clarity, particularly regarding academic dishonesty cases. It is important for faculty to be aware of this update, so they are not caught off guard. If you have any concerns or feedback, please let me know

AP 6400 Audits: As discussed last week, there are concerns regarding AP 6400, particularly around the independence and objectivity of the internal auditing process.

The new language in the policy may require the internal auditor to report to various bodies during investigations and includes language that could potentially undermine confidentiality and whistleblower protections. This has raised concerns about the potential for conflicts of interest and a lack of transparency in the process. There is also language that suggests that HR will investigate itself if there are any complaints about HR.

We were told that the changes are driven by legal and the Chancellor's directives, but the internal auditor has raised concerns that some of these changes contradict state guidelines, specifically the Red Book (the set of compliance standards for auditors). There are significant concerns about how these changes might affect the investigative process, especially if an individual is reluctant to report issues for fear of retaliation or exposure, or transparency, in the case of HR recused from the internal auditing process.

Senator Sachs: There are overlaps between the internal audit and HR. I can speak from experience. **Senator Kennedy:** Everyone expressed that it is difficult to separate the two functions, and the primary concern is ensuring that feedback from those involved in the process is still gathered. It is important that this feedback continues, as it is crucial for addressing ongoing concerns about processes. **Senator Sachs**: One concern is that one of the pathways to initiate an internal audit goes directly through Human Resources.

The internal auditor is an independent role and is not directly tied to any specific processes within the District, whereas Human Resources (HR) is part of the District's operational structure. The concern revolves around potential overlap between the two functions. I am unsure who specifically is raising concerns about this, but I wanted to clarify the distinction between the two roles. Additionally, I want to remind everyone that there is currently a reporting option on the OCC home page, under the "Faculty and Staff" section, where individuals can anonymously or openly report concerns related to fraud, waste, ethics violations, or process issues. This has been available for the past two months. The internal auditor will be attending the Senate meeting next week to explain these issues in more detail and answer any questions. I encourage you to attend and hear directly from the expert.

Concerns about Transparency and 10 + 1: We are seeing an increase in top-down decisions that are not being fully communicated or reviewed, which has led to frustration among faculty and staff. For example, there is a new set of District procedures on travel that the IPD/PDI chairs and District accounting were reviewing. Faculty and Classified feedback had been provided to the District, but it seems the District may not have incorporated those into the newest draft, as we requested. I will report more on that after our next meeting on Wednesday.

Vice President Gordon: The last-minute addition of items and being told to approve them without a clear understanding highlights the difference between shared governance at the college level and at the district level. Years ago, we experienced similar issues at the college, but that has not been the case for some time. Shared governance at the college level has generally been effective. However, at the District level, there are significant issues with shared governance. We should consider agendizing this for further discussion.

5. New Business

A. Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP) - Jennifer Hall and Sheri Sterner:

Sheri Sterner: I will provide a brief overview and address the key points, as I want to leave time for your questions. Jennifer Hall, the faculty co-chair of the Student Success and Enrollment Committee, is unable to attend today. She is currently working at Ocean View

College, counseling prospective students, which takes priority over being here. I am here on behalf of the committee to present an update. We previously brought this plan to you in the spring, received campus feedback through small group discussions—including input from faculty on the committee—and incorporated that feedback into the plan. The updated plan was then reviewed and endorsed by the Student Success and Enrollment Committee in early fall. Today, I am here to present it for final endorsement. The campus feedback we received highlighted the following points:

1. **Elevate Populations & Impact on Smaller Programs**: There were concerns about the impact on smaller programs, and we've made some language adjustments to address this in the draft.

2. **Utilizing Current Systems:** A suggestion was made to maximize the use of current systems rather than seeking new ones, which we have incorporated into the plan.

3. **Resources to Implement the Plan**: Many expressed concerns about resources, which we addressed by noting that resource allocation will be handled in the implementation phase. Any feedback related to resources will be forwarded to the team responsible for implementing the plan.

We have identified a few key areas to focus on during implementation based on the feedback:

1. **Faculty Buy-In for Starfish**: There was concern about faculty engagement with the Starfish platform. We modified the language in the plan to not only include Starfish but also to broadly address the concept of Starfish-related technology, which is still to be determined.

2. **Dual Enrollment**: A significant amount of feedback, particularly from faculty, raised concerns about expanding dual enrollment as a strategy. This was discussed in the committee, and we have taken the feedback into account in the plan.

3. **Counseling Capacity**: There were multiple comments regarding the capacity of the counseling department. To address this, we included an objective and action item in the plan to evaluate counseling capacity and address any issues.

4. **Metrics:** Feedback on the metrics section of the plan suggested it was overly prescriptive. We removed a specific objective about metrics and instead included it as an action item to simply "consider measures."

5. **Revised Language and Responsible Parties:** We revised the language in the plan and updated the leads and responsible parties based on feedback.

These are the main updates from the feedback we received. If you have questions, I am happy to provide more details or return at a later time. Otherwise, I'll leave it here and open the floor for discussion.

Senator Kennedy: Is there any evaluation of student mental health needs? I am finding that mental health issues are increasingly affecting students' ability to complete their coursework. **Sheri Sterner:** I will need to check if we have that information. I had printed out a document to bring with me but accidentally left it in my office. I will review it and provide the details to Beatriz Rodriguez Vaca. While we do discuss student support services, I am not sure if mental health is explicitly mentioned. Let me verify that and get back to you.

This item will be back on the consent agenda at the following meeting.

B. Academic Standards Committee Report – Leland Paxton: This agenda item was postponed for a future agenda item.

6. Adjournment

President Drew adjourned the meeting at 12:28 p.m.

Minutes: Approved November 12, 2024

MINUTES: First draft written by Beatriz Rodriguez Vaca, Administrative Assistant to the Senates. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by Senate Secretary, Marilyn Kennedy, who also distributes the final Senate-approved version to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees members and secretary, union presidents, GWC and Coastline Academic Senate presidents, OCC College President, and faculty as per OCC Senate bylaws.

Senate Membership & Voting Tally Chart	Motion 1 Minutes 10/29/24	Motion 2 Consent Agenda	Motion 3 Extend time for 5 minutes
Ball, Jason: Part-Time Senator (2024-2025); 11:31am	Aye	Aye	Aye
Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Becker, Lauren: Senator at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Blystone, Allissa: Math & Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Budwig, Eric: Technology Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Drew, Rendell: President, Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Carly Gonzalez: Senator at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Gordon, Lee: Vice President, Senator-at-Large (2022-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Kennedy, Marilyn: Secretary, Lit. & Lang. Senator (2022-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Legaspi, Jodie: Athletics and Kinesiology Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Marcina, Vesna, Senator-at-Large (Fall 2024)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Kate McCarroll, Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Naesse, Irene: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Neil, Jeanne: Business and Computing Senator (2022-2025)	Absent	Absent	Absent
Paxton, Leland: Part-Time Senator (2024-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Sachs, Loren: Senator-at-Large (2022-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Sheehan, Katherine (2024-2027); 11:39am	Absent	Aye	Aye
Stanton, Jordan: Social & Beh. Sciences Senator (2022-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	VACANT	VACANT	VACANT
Vacant, Part-Time Senator (2024-2025)	VACANT	VACANT	VACANT
Vacant: Consumer Health Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	VACANT	VACANT	VACANT