| | |
| | |

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.

To ensure that RSI is effectively implemented, evaluations similar to a J1b process will be

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:
  x Approximately 12-18 hours if the instructor has no prior training in Canvas.
  x Roughly 6-10 hours if the instructor already has experience with Canvas.
  x 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)

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