



**REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**REGULAR MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

**College of the Redwoods**

- **Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road– Board Room – SS 202**
- **Crescent City: 883 W Washington Blvd, Rooms E-2 and E-3**

**May 3, 2019 – 1:00 pm**

**AGENDA**

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Introductions and Public Comments:** Members of the audience are invited to make comments regarding any subject appropriate to the Academic Senate
3. **Approve Academic Senate Minutes**
  - 3.1 **April 19, 2019 Academic Senate Minutes** (Attachment)
4. **Action Items:**
  - 4.1 **Emeritus Status Susan Nordlof:** Peter Blakemore (Attachment)
5. **Discussion**
  - 5.1 **AP 4105 Distance Education:** Karen Reiss (Attachment)
6. **Reports**
  - 6.1 **Assessment Committee eLumen for Assessment:** Phillip Mancus
  - 6.2 **College Update:** Angelina Hill
  - 6.3 **Associated Students of College of the Redwoods (ASCR) Update:** Joshua Mata ASCR Representative
7. **Future Agenda Items:** Senators are encouraged to request to place an item on a future agenda
8. **Announcements and Open Forum**
  - 8.1 Faculty of the Year
  - 8.2 Academic Senate Website <http://internal.redwoods.edu/Senate/>
  - 8.3 District Meeting Calendar/Website - <http://internal.redwoods.edu/>
9. **Adjourn**

**Public Notice—Nondiscrimination**

College of the Redwoods does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, color or disability in any of its programs or activities. College of the Redwoods is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Upon request this publication will be made available in alternate formats. Please contact Academic Senate Support, 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, Eureka, CA 95501, (707) 476-4259; Office Hours, M – F 8:30 am – 5:00 pm (hours vary due to meeting schedules).

***This page intentionally left blank***



**REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**REGULAR MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

College of the Redwoods

- Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road– Board Room – SS 202
- Crescent City: 883 W Washington Blvd, Rooms E-2 and E-3

April 19, 2019 – 1:00 pm

**MINUTES DRAFT FOR REVIEW**

**Members Present:** Peter Blakemore, Gary Sokolow, Stuart Altschuler, Kristy Carlsen, Mike Dennis, Chris Gaines, Will Meriwether, Shannon Mondor, Ruth Moon, Hillary Reed, Michael Richards, Wendy Riggs, Lisa Sayles, Shemya Vaughn, Erin Wall, Mark Winter (for Todd Olsen), Joshua Mata (ASCR Representative), and Jessica Frint (support)

**Members Absent:** Angelina Hill and Levi Gill

**Others present:** Sean Thomas, Michelle Haggerty, John Johnston, Natalia Margulis, Dave Bazard (for Angelina Hill), and Paul Chown

1. **Call to Order:** Peter Blakemore called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm
2. **Introductions and Public Comments:** There were no public comments.
3. **Approve Academic Senate Minutes**
  - 3.1 **April 5, 2019 Academic Senate Minutes:** On a motion by Michael Richards, seconded by Wendy Riggs, the minutes of April 5, 2019 were unanimously approved as submitted.
4. **Action Items:**
  - 4.1 **Approve April 12, 2019 Curriculum Committee Recommendations:** The Curriculum Committee Recommendations of April 12, 2019 were approved through roll call vote: Stuart Altschuler voted yes, Kristy Carlsen voted yes, Michael Dennis voted yes, Chris Gaines voted yes, Will Meriwether voted yes, Shannon Mondor voted yes, Ruth Moon voted yes, Hillary Reed voted yes, Mark Winter (for Todd Olsen) voted yes, Michael Richards voted yes, Wendy Riggs voted yes, Lisa Sayles voted yes, Shemya Vaughn voted yes, Erin Wall voted yes.
  - 4.2 **Emeritus Status:** On a motion by Michael Dennis, seconded by Wendy Riggs, Emeritus Status for Steve Brown and Michael Richards was approved by roll-call vote. Stuart Altschuler voted yes, Kristy Carlsen voted yes, Michael Dennis voted yes, Chris Gaines voted yes, Will Meriwether voted yes, Shannon Mondor voted yes, Ruth Moon voted yes, Hillary Reed voted yes, Mark Winter (for Todd Olsen) voted yes, Wendy Riggs voted yes, Lisa Sayles voted yes, Shemya Vaughn voted yes, Erin Wall voted yes. Michael Richards abstained.
    - 4.2.1 Steve Brown
    - 4.2.2 Michael Richards

**4.3 Area E Taskforce AP 4025 Revision:** Lisa Sayles expressed concerns about this item not coming as a discussion item and while she was in support of it, she had concerns about the amount of work this could create. She additionally expressed that she would like for Area E to be supported in other ways, suggesting professional development. Mark Winters expressed concerns with Social Sciences. He pointed out the last bullet and stated that the specificity listed here was inconsistent with the rest of the categories. John Johnston explained that it was to give ideas and concepts that reflect the spirit, and that they are examples and are not prescriptive. He stated that once this goes to College Council the entire college will have opportunity to provide input as well. Hillary Reed reminded senators that this revision removes barriers for our students. Sean Thomas reminded Senators that this revision is product of being tasked with two main focus points; addressing accreditation recommendations and to evaluate Area E's suitability to institutional needs moving forward. Many Senators expressed their full support of the revision moving forward. On a motion by Erin Wall, seconded by Wendy Riggs. The Area E Taskforce Revision was approved through roll-call vote: Stuart Altschuler voted yes, Kristy Carlsen voted yes, Michael Dennis voted yes, Chris Gaines voted yes, Will Meriwether voted yes, Shannon Mondor voted yes, Ruth Moon voted yes, Hillary Reed voted yes, Mark Winter (for Todd Olsen) voted yes, Michael Richards voted yes, Wendy Riggs voted yes, Lisa Sayles voted yes, Shemya Vaughn voted yes, and Erin Wall voted yes.

## 5. Discussion

**5.1 Faculty Qualifications Committee Petition to Change Qualifications for Discipline:** Michelle Haggerty explained that the Faculty Qualifications Handbook from the Chancellor's office states that the districts may establish local qualifications beyond the minimum standards defined in the disciplines lists. Michelle Haggerty stated that the handbook lists the minimum requirements. She explained that individual disciplines would fill out the form, then it would go to the Faculty Qualifications Committee for review, then would go to the full Senate and then the Board. She explained that it would be a similar process to how equivalencies are routed. Stuart Altschuler expressed concerns about associate faculty's part in the process, specifically in disciplines without full-time faculty. Michelle Haggerty stated that there would be a full-time faculty in an aligned discipline that took the charge so that the associate faculty would have support. Michael Richards expressed his support while expressing concern about the discipline qualifications being raised potentially causing difficulty in finding qualified faculty. He also suggested that safeguards be put in place to avoid manipulation. Erin Wall suggested to have a line added for Dean input. Ruth Moon asked what will happen to faculty that are currently teaching in disciplines that would not meet the new standard and Michelle Haggerty explained that contracts protect faculty, both full-time and associate. Michael Richards asked if the bar being raised caused issues, who would make the proposal to lower it back? Peter Blakemore explained that this would need to go through ASPC, and that this draft is preliminary. Next phase would be for ASPC to review and revise language in the fall.

**5.2 Draft Syllabus Coversheet & Helpful Information:** Dave Bazard explained that it been brought to various Dean's attention that some of the syllabi caused a burden and having different versions for each campus caused confusion. He explained that the new cover sheet lists the minimum required by Ed Code and what is needed for accreditation. He explained that this cover page would be a requirement and then faculty would be strongly encouraged to submit their full syllabi. He showed additional recommended content areas. Hillary Reed suggested a student handbook that would be available on canvas. Michael Richards asked if

he could use his version of the syllabus that contained the same information that he felt was more aesthetic. Peter Blakemore suggested including both versions. Dave Bazard explained that he would take formatting suggestions but that the same form should be used and that this would be implemented in the fall.

**5.3 2019-20 Draft Annual Plan:** Paul Chown stated that the attachment in the packet is a draft and that many pieces are carried forward from last year, some unchanged. He explained that this will be published during convocation and will be worked on throughout the summer. Mark Winters asked about student accessibility and Paul Chown stated that this was being worked on by the Tech Planning Committee.

## 6. Reports

**6.1 Guided Pathways Scale of Adoption Self-Assessment:** Dave Bazard reported that the college is engaged in the Guided Pathways Initiative and faculty coordinators have been assigned to each division. He stated that focus is on completion and that the report is required to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by the 30<sup>th</sup> of this month. He suggested for Senators to contact him if they had any suggestions.

**6.2 College Update:** Angelina Hill was not in attendance.

**6.3 Associated Students of College of the Redwoods (ASCR) Update:** Joshua Mata (ASCR Representative) reported that he took on a new role of Vice President of Regional Affairs. He reported that they unveiled their strategic plan at the last general assembly earlier this month. He also reported that a memorandum of understanding was drafted with California Community Colleges Student Affairs Association (CCCSA). He reported that they are moving back to one general assembly per year and will be held in the spring where elections will be held and resolutions will be submitted. J. Mata reported that ASCR elections were held and the turn-out was low. He explained that this was despite more outreach taking place this semester than the past 5 semesters he has been at the school. He explained that they felt the issue was that students didn't run because they thought that someone else would be taking on that role.

7. **Future Agenda Items:** No requests were made.

## 8. Announcements and Open Forum

- Lisa Sayles announced that Letter of Interest for participation in the CDC OEI Consortium will be due in June and the Self-Assessment packet will be due in December.

8.1 Academic Senate Website <http://internal.redwoods.edu/Senate/>

8.2 District Meeting Calendar/Website - <http://internal.redwoods.edu/>

9. **Adjournment:** On a motion by Stuart Altschuler, seconded by Lisa Sayles, the meeting was adjourned at 2:48 pm.

### Public Notice—Nondiscrimination

College of the Redwoods does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, color or disability in any of its programs or activities. College of the Redwoods is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Upon request this publication will be made available in alternate formats. Please contact Academic Senate Support, 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, Eureka, CA 95501, (707) 476-4259; Office Hours, M – F 8:30 am – 5:00 pm (hours vary due to meeting schedules).

***This page intentionally left blank***



Book	Board Policies
Section	Chapter 7 - Human Resources
Title	Emeritus Title and Status
Code	AP 7384
Status	Active
Adopted	December 2, 1996
Last Revised	October 7, 2014
Last Reviewed	February 25, 2019

### Eligibility

1. The candidate must have performed at least ten years of full-time service to the District or the equivalent in part-time service.
2. The employees seeking the emeritus title shall submit a written request to their Supervisor. An employee may also be nominated for emeritus status by a colleague from the District, with the consent of the nominated employee.

### Process

1. Each nomination for emeritus status shall include a brief narrative summary citing the professional accomplishments and record of District service.
2. The Supervisor will verify eligibility and forward the nomination(s) as follows:
  - a. Faculty nominations go to the Academic Senate for approval; once approved, the Academic Senate forwards the nominations to the President.
  - b. Manager nominations go to the Manager's Council for approval; once approved, the Manager's Council forwards the nominations to the President.
  - c. Classified employee nominations go to the Classified Executive Board for approval; once approved, the Classified Executive Board forwards the nominations to the President.
  - d. Administrator and Confidential employee nominations go directly to the President.
3. The President will submit all employee nominations with the President's recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

### Privileges

- A Certificate of Emeritus status awarded at the time of retirement.
- A permanent ID card indicating emeritus status.
- Complimentary admission to College events.
- Authority to use emeritus title in professional work.

Approved: December 2, 1996  
Revised October 7, 2014

April 22, 2019

Dear Dean Potamianos:

I am writing to you, as my direct Supervisor, to request nomination for Emeritus title and status (according to the process described in AP 7384).

I have served the district for over twenty years as a full-time Professor of English, and before that, for an additional seven years as Associate Faculty and four years in instructional support positions, both part-time and full-time. Over the course of so many years, it's a little difficult to recall all of the committees I've served on and other ways that I dedicated my professional life to the district, but a partial list follows:

- Co-Coordinator of the Honors Program (five years)
- English Department Chair (five years)
- Curriculum Chair (four years)
- Faculty Assessment Coordinator (two years)
- Chair of Ad Hoc Senate GE committee (1 year)
- Member of the following committees: Curriculum, Academic Standards & Policies, Academic Senate, CRFO Executive Committee, Tenure Review Committee, Academic Appeals Committee, and more special Ad Hoc Committees and Evaluation Committees than I have room to list.

Regarding my professional accomplishments, closest to my heart has been my twenty-year association with The Dickens Project, a scholarly consortium based at UC Santa Cruz. For many years, I have served as a Board member on the Friends of the Dickens Project with a focus on promoting the importance of the community college and our students in the California higher education community. In 2011, I collaborated on establishing the annual Dickens Universe Community College Scholarship and have helped with that scholarship ever since. In the past

eight years, four of the scholarship winners have been College of the Redwoods students. The first of these winners, Joshua Commander, has recently launched a non-profit internet start-up, ([www.annotatedlibrary.org](http://www.annotatedlibrary.org)), dedicated to providing “free access to annotated and critical editions of unabridged classic texts and art.” I am serving on the Board of Directors for *Annotated*, which is now allied with the Dickens Project. In the early 2000s, I also served for several years at a Regional representative for The English Council of California Two-Year Colleges.

Of course, my most important professional accomplishment and service to the district has been my work with and for the students of the college, not only in my direct role as their teacher but also in my role as a discipline expert committed to continuously revising and improving the English curriculum.

Thank you for considering my request for Emeritus title and status.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan F Nordlof". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Susan F. Nordlof  
Professor of English

***This page intentionally left blank***

## **AP 4105 Distance Education Draft Revision Endorsed by DEPC 4/27/18; Revised by ASPC 4/12/19**

“Distance education is defined...as a formal interaction which uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and which supports regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously” (ACCJC, 2013). Per Title 5 March 2019, “Distance education means instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by time and/or distance and interact through the assistance of technology.” All distance education is subject to the general requirements of Title 5 Chapter 6, Article 1.

### **Course Quality Standards**

The same standards of course quality shall be applied to all courses including distance education courses. Refer to the Curriculum Handbook.

### **Separate Course Approval**

Every distance education course must have an approved Course Outline of Record and an approved Distance Education Proposal form. Each Distance Education Proposal form must be reviewed and approved separately if the distance education course is standing alone or any of the in-person contact hours are replaced by distance education modalities. The review and approval of new and existing distance education courses shall follow the established curriculum approval procedures, outlined in Administrative Procedure 4020 Program and Curriculum Development and the Curriculum Handbook.

### **Instructor Contact**

Each section of the course that is delivered through distance education shall include regular effective contact and substantive interaction between instructor and students. Instructor contact guidelines can be found on the Curriculum Committee website.

Regular effective contact and substantive interaction shall include the following:

- **Initiated interaction:** Instructors shall regularly initiate interaction with students and determine that they are accessing and comprehending course material and participating regularly in the activities in the course. Instructors shall regularly initiate interaction among students and determine that they are engaging in meaningful discourse about course material. Providing students with an open-ended question forum, although appropriate, does not constitute the entirety of effective instructor initiated interaction.
- **Frequency:** Distance education courses are considered the equivalent to in-person courses. Therefore, the frequency of the contact will be at least the same as would be established in a regular, in-person course. At the very least, the number of instructor contact hours per week that would be available for in-person students will also be available, in asynchronous and/or synchronous mode, for distance education students. Contact shall be distributed in a manner that will ensure that regular contact is

maintained, given the nature of asynchronous instructional methodologies, over the course of a week and should occur as often as is appropriate for the course.

- Establishing expectations and managing unexpected instructor absence: An instructor- and/or department-established policy describing the frequency and timeliness of instructor initiated contact and instructor feedback, will be posted in the syllabus and/or other course documents that are made available for students when the course officially opens each semester. If the instructor must be out of contact briefly for an unexpected reason (such as illness or a family emergency that takes the instructor offline), notification to students will be made in the announcements area of the course that includes when the students can expect regular effective contact to resume. If the offline time results in a lengthy absence (i.e. more than three or four days), a substitute instructor should be sought who can assist students while the instructor is unavailable.

Minimum Contact: Instructors shall, at a minimum, use the following resources to initiate contact with students:

- Threaded discussion forums (or equivalent communication modalities) with appropriate instructor participation.
- General email/messages.
- Weekly announcements in the Learning Management System.
- Timely feedback on student work as specified in the DE Course Outline of Record.
- Instructor-prepared materials (text-based, audio files, and/or video files), in addition to any publisher created materials (written, recorded, broadcast, etc.) that, combined with other course materials, creates the “virtual equivalent” of the in-person class.

Other Types of Contact: Instructors may also choose to use other forms of communication, as mentioned in Section 55204 of Title 5 (“...through group or individual meetings, orientation and review sessions, supplemental seminar or study sessions, field trips, library workshops, telephone contact, correspondence, voice mail, email, or other activities”) and/or video conference, screen-sharing, podcast, or other technologies may also be included. It is also suggested that instructors should have a threaded discussion that is set aside for general questions about the course.

### **Student Authentication Process**

Consistent with federal regulations pertaining to federal financial aid eligibility, the District shall authenticate or verify that the student who registers in a distance education or correspondence education course is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit.

The Chief Instruction Officer (CIO) shall authorize one or more methods to authenticate or verify the student’s identity that are approved by federal regulation. For the Redwoods Community College District (RCCD), authentication uses secure credentialing/login and password within applicable course management systems, which is specifically referenced in the federal regulations as an appropriate and accepted procedure for verifying a student’s identity.

## Online Course Proctoring

Instructors of online classes are encouraged ~~have important exams proctored~~ **to give serious consideration to which assessments require proctoring.** ~~For enrolled students, proctoring is available at any College location.~~ **Established proctoring procedures are publicly available and sites may include any of the College of the Redwoods campuses and off-site proctors approved by the instructor and administrative supervisor, or the instructor may opt to use virtual proctoring software (e.g., Proctorio).** **If proctoring is used, explicit guidelines should be outlined in the syllabus.**

~~Students distant from a College location may use a proctor not affiliated with the College who meets any of the following criteria: librarian, testing coordinator, administrator, or teacher at an elementary or secondary school, community college, or university. In addition, military chaplains, testing administrators, education services officers, or prison officials are acceptable. These or other alternatives must be approved by the instructor and supervising administrator. It is the student's responsibility to make arrangements with the proctor using the College "Student/Proctor Agreement Form" and to pay all costs for proctoring.~~

## Privacy

**At the time of registration,** the District shall provide to each student ~~at the time of registration~~ a statement of the process in place to protect student privacy **as well as an estimate of any and estimated additional student charges associated with verification of student identity,** ~~if any.~~

## ADA Compliance

~~All distance education is subject to the requirements of Title 5 as well as the requirements imposed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S. Code Sections 12100 et seq.) and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S. Code Section 794d).~~

~~Also, see Administrative Procedure 3412 Access to Programs and Facilities.~~

## Student Accessibility

**All distance education courses shall be accessible whereby, "a person with a disability is afforded the opportunity to acquire the same information, engage in the same interactions, and enjoy the same services as a person without a disability in an equally effective and equally integrated manner, with substantially equivalent ease of use" ("Maintaining Access to Information Technology: A Guide for California Community Colleges," March 2017).** **All distance education is subject to the requirements of Title 5 as well as the requirements imposed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S. Code Sections 12100 et seq.) and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S. Code Section 794d).**

## Student Accommodations

**Distance education students will be provided reasonable accommodations as determined by the College's Disability Services and Programs for Students. Both state and federal law require community colleges to operate all programs and activities in a manner which is accessible to**

qualified individuals with disabilities, also referred to in federal law as “qualified handicapped persons” (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; 29 U.S.C. § 794 and 42 U.S.C. § 12101).

### **Interactive Video Course (Telepresence) Loss of Connectivity**

All interactive video course students shall have equal opportunity to live instruction. Instructors will develop policies that attempt to maintain equity in the event that a remote site loses access, whether due to equipment malfunction, power outage, or other circumstances. Strategies may include rescheduling the class session, developing alternative assignments, providing video/audio recordings, or video conferencing during an office hour, etc. In no case shall students’ grades be affected by their non-participation due to loss of connectivity.

### **Instructor Preparation and Professional Development**

Faculty shall meet qualification criteria as outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) in order to teach in a distance education modality. The college is responsible for providing professional development opportunities for distance education faculty based on evolving pedagogy, available technology, and learning needs.

### **Evaluation of Instructors**

Instructors teaching online classes shall be systematically routinely evaluated using criteria applied to all classes, in addition to instructors, as well as criteria specific to online instruction.

### **Student Grievances**

The CIO or designee will ensure that distance education students are informed about and have access to a student grievance process. Additionally, the District will maintain a file of all student grievances related to distance education and their resolutions. This file will not be used for the purpose of evaluating faculty.

### **REFERENCES:**

“Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education” ACCJC publication, July 2013; Title 5 Sections 55200 et seq.; U.S. Department of Education regulations on the Integrity of Federal Student Financial Aid Programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Title 34 Code of Federal Regulations - Section 602.17.Certification Standards for Online Teaching