

Minutes of the
MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
April 25, 2011

APPROVED

PRESENT: Bruce Bishop, Monika Brannick, Melinda Carrillo, Haydn Davis, Katy French, Lori Graham, Erin Hartensveld, Barb Kelber, Teresa Laughlin, Jackie Martin-Klement, Pam McDonough, Linda Morrow, Wendy Nelson, Patrick O'Brien, Perry Snyder, Diane Studinka, Fari Towfiq

ABSENT:

GUESTS: Marlita Donan, Greg Larson, Shayla Sivert

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the President, Monika Brannick, at 2:00 p.m., in Room SU-30.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion 1 MSC Laughlin, Morrow: Faculty Senate approval of the minutes of April 18, 2011, as amended. The motion carried.

In discussing the April 18 minutes, Senators revisited the Palomar Faculty Federation report, specifically with regard to Teresa Laughlin's reminder that all faculty members should avoid the risk of compromising negotiations by refraining from formal or informal conversations in meetings with administrators about items involving mandatory subjects of bargaining.

To assure clarity, Teresa Laughlin distributed a copy of the document, "Subjects In & Out of the Scope of Bargaining," (Appendix A) which lists subjects considered to be within and outside of the scope. She added that caution should be used in campus discussions which can be misconstrued as negotiations. She added that it is an administrator's responsibility to end those conversations if they are initiated.

Additional discussion occurred regarding the need to identify certain items as academic and professional, clearly within the purview of the Senate, and to make distinctions about the potential to cross over into bargaining issues.

Some Senators felt that there should be more freedom in meetings to discuss any issue, as long as no final decision is being made and all present understand that the item being talked about would have to go to PFF for negotiations. It was noted, though, that such discussions help to build a preconceived consensus which may, in turn, even hinder the negotiations process.

Under Title 5, the Academic Senate's primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters. The term "academic and professional matters" refers to the following policy development and implementation matters:

1. Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies

4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for program review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
11. Other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

Public Comments: There were no public comments.

Announcements: Monika Brannick announced that Palomar College's second annual LGBTQ Pride Event, "*What Do You Take Pride In?*" will be held Tuesday, April 26 starting at 10:00 a.m. on the Student Union patio. This year's event will feature a live DJ, Open Mic session, and games and prizes.

Curriculum: The next meeting of the Curriculum Committee will be held on May 4, 2011.

Monika Brannick reminded the Senate that all faculty are invited to attend a SB1440 workshop on April 30 (Saturday) at Coast Community College District Offices. More information is available at <http://www.asccc.org/events/2011/04/regional-curriculum-training-1>.

Faculty Task Force: At last week's meeting, Senators briefly discussed budget issues, enrollment, and other pending decisions that will have a large impact on community colleges. In an effort to be proactive, Monika Brannick suggested that the Senate consider forming a faculty group or task force to provide recommendations on how Palomar can move forward and participate in these changing times.

Lengthy discussion addressed the question of whether forming a task force would be productive, or if the current shared governance process is sufficient to create opportunities for the kind of faculty involvement Brannick hopes for. There was agreement that faculty share a frustration, wishing to engage in the process and to be a constructive force in decision-making, but opinions varied on whether it would be useful to form another subgroup separate from the group of faculty who already serve on the Strategic Planning Council (SPC). There was concern expressed that it could even create redundancy or have a divisive effect on those faculty members serving in representative positions. One Senator suggested a special meeting of SPC faculty who might like to help with the effort Brannick envisions.

After further discussing the issue, Senators agreed that a good start would be a change in the approach to the regular meetings between President Deegan, the Faculty Senate President and Vice President. Senators suggested that Brannick and Towfiq could bring topics of concern to the agenda and express the desire of the faculty to be heard and involved in governance and decision-making.

Committee
Appointments:

Motion 2 MSC O'Brien, Hartensveld: Faculty Senate approval of the following committee appointments:

Academic Standards and Practices

(11-13) Jim Gilardi/Life Sciences, MNHS

(11-13) Nimoli Madan, English as a Second Language, Language and Literature

Academic Technology Committee

(11-13) Arts, Business, Media, and Computing Systems

Michael Gilkey/Business Administration

(11-13) Arts, Business, Media, and Computing Systems

Chris Sinnott/Performing Arts,

(11-13) Languages and Literature

Carlos Pedroza/World Languages

(11-13) Languages and Literature

Christine Barkley/English

(11-13) Part-time

Michael V. Bartulis/Computer Science and Information Systems, AMBCS

Basic Skills Committee/Title V, HSI Steering Committee

(11-14) Counseling - Gabriel Sanchez/Counseling

(10-13) Mathematics-Leila Safaralian/Mathematics

(11-14) Reading-Melinda Carrillo/Reading Services

Bookstore Subcommittee

(11-13) Yan Tian/Mathematics, MNHS

Curriculum Committee

(11-14) Arts, Media, Business & Computer Science

Lillian Payn/Graphic Communications

(09-12) Social and Behavioral Sciences

Linda Locklear/American Indian Studies

(09-12) Language and Literature

Marty Furch/ English as a Second Language

(11-14) Mathematics and the Natural & Health Sciences

Monika Brannick/Mathematics

Distinguished Faculty Award Committee

(11-13) Bill Jahnel/History, Social and Behavioral Sciences

(11-13) Julia Robinson/Nursing Education, MNHS

(11-13) Part-time Faculty

Rachael Horn/ Sociology, Social and Behavioral Sciences

Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee

(11-13) Fari Towfiq/Mathematics

Equivalency Committee

(11-13) Languages and Literature

Kathleen Sheehan/World Languages

(11-13) MNHS
Gregory Larson/Mathematics
(11-13) Social and Behavioral Sciences
Byung Kang/Library

Faculty Service Area Review Committee
(11-13) AMB&S
Tony Smith/Computer Science and Information Systems

Food Services Committee
(11-13) Steve Perry/Computer Science and Information Systems, AMBCS

Instructional Planning Council
(10-12) member of the subcommittee - Christine Barkley/English

Learning Outcomes Council
(10-12) Languages and Literature
Melinda Carrillo/Reading Services

Matriculation and Transfer Committee
(11-13) Reading- Melinda Carrillo/Reading Services
(11-13) at-large (part-time) - Lorena Lomeli-Hixon/Counseling

Personnel Standards & Practices Committee
(11-13) Tony Smith/ Computer Science and Information Systems, AMBCS

Professional Development Advisory Board
(11-13) Adjunct Faculty Member
Marian Spaid- Ross/Behavioral Science

Professional Procedures Committee
(11-13) Richard Albistegui-DuBois/ Life Sciences, MNHS

Safety & Security Committee
(11-13) Michael Finton/ Emergency Medical Education, Career Technical and Extended Education
(11-13) Carl Lofthouse/Public Safety, Career Technical and Extended Education

Scholarship Committee
(11-13) Jose Esteban/ Economics/History/Political Science Department, Social and Behavioral Science
(11-13) Byung Kang/Library, Social and Behavioral Science
(10-12) Lisa Romain/Counseling, Student Services
(10-12) Susan Miller/Behavioral Sciences

Sabbatical Leave Committee
(11-14) Arts, Media, Business and Computing Systems
Ronald Burgher/Computer Information Systems

(11-14) Languages and Literature
Pamela McDonough

Strategic Planning Council

(11-13) Mary Furch/English as a Second Language, Languages and Literature

Student Program Eligibility Appeals Committee

(11-13) Faculty representative appointed by Faculty Senate
Carol Lowther/ESL, Language and Literature

Vocational and Technical Educational Act Planning and Advisory Committee

(11-13) Sandra Andre/ Design and Consumer Education, Career Technical and Extended Education

(11-13) Dennis Lutz/ Design and Consumer Education, Career Technical and Extended Education

The motion carried.

Motion 3

MSC O'Brien, Laughlin: Faculty Senate acceptance of the results of the ballot for the following committee appointments:

Academic Review Committee

(11-13) faculty members from Instructional Divisions and/or Library

Melinda Carrillo/Reading Services, Languages and Literature

Richard Stegman/Computer Science and Information Systems, AMBCS

(11-13) Counseling

Elvia Nunez/Counseling

Basic Skills Committee/Title V, HSI Steering Committee (11-14) At-large

Marty Furch/English as a Second Language, Languages and Literature

Campus Police Committee (11-13)

Henry Pete Ordille/Emergency Medical Education, Career Technical and Extended Education

Disability Resource Center Advisory Committee (11-13)

Byung Kang/Library, Social and Behavioral Sciences

Faculty Service Area Review Committee (11-13) MNH&S

Mark Lane/Earth Sciences

Palomar College Committee to Combat Hate (PC3H) (11-13)

Monika Brannick/Mathematics

Bruce Orton/English

Abbie Cory/English

Sabbatical Leave Committee

(11-13) Languages and Literature

Pam McDonough/English

Team Life Committee (11-13)

Kelly Falcone/Physical Education, Social and Behavioral Sciences

The motion carried.

SLOAC Coordinator
and Assistant Faculty
Coordinator of the
Learning Outcomes
Council:

Senators reviewed the letters of interest for the SLOAC Coordinator and Assistant Faculty Coordinator of the Learning Outcomes Council.

Motion 4

MSC Morrow, French: Faculty Senate approval of the appointment of Marty Furch as the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) Coordinator. The motion carried.

Motion 5

MSC Bishop, Hartensveld: Faculty Senate approval of the appointment of Katy French as the Assistant Faculty Coordinator of the Learning Outcomes Council. The motion carried.

Academic Technology
Coordinator:

Senators reviewed the letters of interest from faculty wishing to be considered for the position of Academic Technology Coordinator. Monika Brannick noted that this is a joint appointment made by the Faculty Senate and the Superintendent/President.

Motion 6

MSC Laughlin, Hartensveld: Faculty Senate support of the appointment of Lillian Payn to the position of Academic Technology Resources Coordinator. The motion carried.

Academic Technology
Validation Checklist:

Haydn Davis provided copies of the "Validation of Preparedness to Teach Online" document several weeks ago. (See Appendix B).

Following the 2009 Accreditation process, Palomar College was advised to develop a means of validating the quality of its Distance Education program. The Academic Technology Committee was charged with several elements of the task, which resulted in the development of a checklist and potential rating system for the validation of courses. He placed the document on the overhead projector and provided Senators with information on how the document will be used, and a question and answer period followed.

One Senator expressed concern that if the document is provided to department chairs, it may be utilized in the faculty evaluation process and should, therefore, be sent through the Tenure and Evaluations Review Board (TERB) and the negotiations process. It was suggested that the document be used instead as a self-check for instructors teaching online, rather than potentially being used as a way to evaluate faculty outside of the current process.

Davis emphasized that this means of validation is intended to promote the use of best practices in developing online classes and is not connected with TERB. The process also ensures that instructors receive relevant training when needed.

Discussion followed on the usefulness of the document as a self assessment tool along with training to assist in the process.

Motion 7 MSC Laughlin, Martin-Klement: As a first step, the Faculty Senate accepts the document "Validation of Preparedness to Teach Online" to be used as a self-assessment tool for faculty wishing to teach online courses. The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Neault Kelber, Secretary

Subjects In & Out of the Scope of Bargaining

Subjects within Scope

Affirmative action plans
Arbitration, binding, of discipline (except for classified employees)
arbitration, binding, of grievances
benefits,
Bidding, procedures for job assignment
calendar, school
caseloads
certificated salary scale
class size
classloads
compensation
compensation, expanded criteria for
contracting out bargaining unit work
current employees
disciplinary procedures
discrimination – union activity
discrimination – sex, race, religion, etc.
dues, other payroll deductions
equipment
grievance procedures
health care plans
hours of work, instructional day
hours transfer of bargaining unit work
including bulletin boards, mail system,
including post-employment benefits for
holidays
job or duty reassignment
job reclassification
layoff effects: notice, layoff order,
meetings
negotiations groundrules
outside unit transfers
overtime work, assignment of
personnel files, entries to
personnel files, union access to
placement of former administrators on
preparation time
reduction in hours in lieu of layoff
reductions in hours of vacant unit
positions
reinstatement rights
release time
representation
retirement, early

safety
seniority
student grievance policy
tools and equipment
training, in-service, if impact on wages,
union access to employer facilities,
union right to be present at grievance
union right to information related to

Subjects Outside of Scope

advisory committee formed by employer
agency or fair share fees, amount of
agreement, printing & distribution to
employees
arbitration, binding, of classified
employee discipline (Ed. Code
preemption
benefits for retirees or former employees
budget process
classified, creation of, to cover new
function
decision to stop operating federally
funded program
employees outside unit, matters affecting
layoff, decision to implement
layoff, timing of
non-smoking policy
position elimination, ceasing a function
staffing needs
union right to information related to
representation
union right to seek unit modification
union statutory right to file grievances in
its name, to arbitrate w/o consent of
grievant

VALIDATION OF PREPAREDNESS TO TEACH ONLINE

PALOMAR COLLEGE

Fall 2010

SUBMITTED BY
ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Introduction

Following the 2009 Accreditation process, Palomar College was advised to develop a means of validating the quality of its Distance Education program. The Senate Academic Technology Committee was charged with this task which resulted in the development of the checklist rating instrument presented below. A committee of dedicated instructors, some of whom teach online, identified the important elements of a high quality (Accomplished) online course. The process the committee took was the familiar one of reviewing the relevant literature, examining what other institutions had done in this regard (see reference section) and then developing our own checklist document based partly upon the best practices of other institutions.

The Senate Academic Technology Committee (ATC) developed a checklist instrument, the *Palomar College Online Course Validation Checklist* that was designed to identify the necessary and desirable attributes and best practices that an accomplished online course would have. A pilot-test of the validation checklist was conducted during the Spring, 2009 semester by arrangement with the instructors-of-record for several online courses. Based on the pilot-test some modifications to the checklist were made.

It is suggested that the *Palomar College Online Course Validation Checklist* may serve as a series of benchmarks that can be used to provide formative assessments of online courses. A rating of “Accomplished Online Course” will document the online instructor’s preparedness to teach an online class at Palomar College. A rating of “Incomplete Online Course” will indicate areas that require revision. Note that this assessment rating instrument is not intended to be used in any TERB-related

evaluation. Further, ATC recommends that the online instructor whose course is being assessed should be consulted during the assessment process and provided a means to question and discuss any negative assessment of his/her online course.

Palomar Online Course Validation Checklist

How to use the Validation Checklist

This checklist provides a roadmap to developing a high quality course beginning with the online syllabus and continuing with course design/organization, aesthetic design, interaction and collaboration, effective use of technology and assessments. In addition, the course design shows a good faith effort to ensure universal access for all students and meets Section 508 standards of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Use the columns to the right of each statement to assess whether or not the course contains that particular element. Place a ✓ next to the item if the statement has been met. Not applicable (N/A) is marked when the element does not apply to a particular course. A space for comments is provided next to each checkbox. The bottom of each section is available to add more detailed commentary

Please Select an overall descriptive rating (Accomplished or Incomplete) for each section:

Accomplished: Most or all elements of the sections are addressed.

Incomplete: Some elements of the sections are addressed but many are lacking.

Course Title _____ Section# _____
Instructor _____
Reviewed by _____ Date _____

Section 1: Course Information

This section refers to the online course syllabus and course information including objectives, student learning outcomes, course requirements and academic integrity.	✓	N/ A	COMMENTS
Syllabus is easily located.			
Syllabus is available in a printer-friendly format.			
Course catalog information is provided: Description, units, prerequisites.			
Instructor contact information is available.			
Instructor office hours are available (online/on-campus).			
Required and supplemental textbooks, readings lists and course materials are listed.			
Learning objectives are clearly stated.			
Course Student Learning Outcomes are stated.			
Course communication instructions/guidelines are stated (i.e. Instructor email guidelines).			
Grading policy is clearly stated.			
Directions are CLEAR and easy to understand for tasks/assignments.			
Academic integrity policy is clearly presented.			
Specific technology requirements are stated (if needed).			
Late and make-up work policy is clearly stated.			
Student support: Course contains extensive information about being an online learner and links to campus resources.			
An orientation for the course is offered, online or on campus.			
<u>Detailed Commentary:</u>			overall rating (circle one): Accomplished Incomplete

Section 2: Course Design and Organization

Course Design and Organization refers to elements of instructional design in an online course. This includes: the structure, instructional strategies, and the overall course set-up or course classroom.	✓	N/ A	COMMENTS	
Course is well-organized and easy to navigate.				
Course structure is clear and understandable.				
Content is made available to students in manageable segments or "chunks" (e.g. organized by weeks, units, chapters).				
Content is appropriate for student learning of course objectives.				
Course schedule (calendar) is summarized in one place and clearly identifies overall plan of the course.				
Accessibility issues are addressed: color compliance and screen readability.				
All links used in the course are accurate and up-to-date.				
A timeframe is stated for modules, activities, and assessment.				
<u>Detailed Commentary:</u>				overall rating (circle one): Accomplished Incomplete

Section 3: Aesthetic design

Aesthetic design refers to the overall appearance of the course and includes visual aspects such as color, typeface, images and other elements key to presenting the course material.	✓	N/A	COMMENTS
A course banner is used to identify the course.			
Color and texture do not overpower the course information.			
Sufficient contrast between text and background makes information easy to read.			
Design keeps course pages to a comfortable length with white space.			
Images are used in course design to support course content.			
Images are accompanied by text descriptions (Alt text) or captions for images that require a more complex description.			
Typeface is easy to read. Documents are created using Sans Serif fonts (e.g. Calibri, Arial or Tahoma) with a size of 12 point or higher.			
Styles such as titles and headings are used to format the document.			
Data organized in rows and columns are put in a table.			
Spelling and grammar are accurate.			
<u>Detailed Commentary:</u>			overall rating (circle one): Accomplished Incomplete

Section 4: Interaction and Collaboration

Interaction and Collaboration refers to the extent to which there is student-instructor, student-student, and student-content interaction. Exemplary courses should integrate many different ways to interact and collaborate in the online environment.	✓	N/A	COMMENTS
Student participation requirements/expectations are clearly stated.			
Instructor provides announcements/reminders.			
Instructor email response time is clearly stated.			
Regular feedback about student performance is provided in a timely manner throughout the course (example: discussion board posts, assignments, quizzes, etc.).			
Course promotes an active discussion area which encourages students to reply to each other.			
Contact is initiated with students in a variety of ways: (Select all that apply.) <input type="checkbox"/> Announcements <input type="checkbox"/> Phone conversations <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in discussion board <input type="checkbox"/> Chat sessions or virtual meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Email <input type="checkbox"/> Voice enabled messages <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in online group collaboration projects <input type="checkbox"/> Face-to-face meetings (review sessions, scheduled meetings)			
Communication/collaboration tools used in the course: <input type="checkbox"/> Email <input type="checkbox"/> Chat room <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion board <input type="checkbox"/> Whiteboard <input type="checkbox"/> other <input type="checkbox"/> Student presentations			

<u>Detailed Commentary:</u>	overall rating (circle one): Accomplished Incomplete
-----------------------------	--

Section 5: Effective use of Technology

Effective Use of Course Technology refers to the successful integration of technology into the online course and its use in a variety of formats that help students to achieve course goals and objectives.	✓	N/ A	COMMENTS
Course makes effective use of online instructional tools.			
Course materials are presented using appropriate formats compatible across computer platform (pdf, rtf, mp3, etc.).			
Audio materials (mp3, wav, etc.) are accompanied by a transcript.			
Videos and screencasts are closed-captioned.			
Presentations are created using design templates found in the software and incorporate the above practices.			
Computer-simulated demonstrations are used to convey information.			
Social media tools (such as, Twitter, Facebook, Flickr) are used.			
What tools are used in the course? (Select all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> Email <input type="checkbox"/> Chat <input type="checkbox"/> Journals <input type="checkbox"/> Calendar <input type="checkbox"/> Gradebook <input type="checkbox"/> Video/DVD <input type="checkbox"/> Graphics/Images <input type="checkbox"/> Wikis <input type="checkbox"/> Image Database <input type="checkbox"/> Blogs <input type="checkbox"/> Animations <input type="checkbox"/> Whiteboard <input type="checkbox"/> Audio <input type="checkbox"/> Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Podcasts <input type="checkbox"/> Quiz tool <input type="checkbox"/> Glossary <input type="checkbox"/> presentations/portfolios			
<u>Detailed Commentary:</u>			overall rating (circle one): Accomplished Incomplete

Section 6: Assessment /Evaluation

The assessment category focuses on the ways in which the student is evaluated toward achieving the student learning outcomes and the quality, type, structure, and security of the assessments used.	✓	N/ A	COMMENTS
Assessments are used throughout the course (e.g. not just one final exam).			
Anti-plagiarism software is used for written assignments.			
Sample assignments are provided to illustrate instructor expectations.			
Detailed instructions and tips for completing assignments are provided.			
Appropriate security measures are enabled when computer testing, such as:			
Time limitations are placed on exams given online.			
Exams are password protected.			
Exams are proctored in a supervised environment if exams are given face to face.			
Exams are composed of question pools where possible to ensure online students have equivalent but different online tests.			
Questions on exams are seen one at a time.			

Students cannot backtrack.			
<u>Detailed Commentary:</u>			overall rating (circle one): Accomplished Incomplete

References Consulted

- California State University – Chico’s influential *Rubric for Online Instruction* was developed to “develop and evaluate online courses” <http://www.csuchico.edu/celt/roi/> This rating system is now used throughout the California State University system as well as in other colleges and universities.
- The North American Council for Online Learning (NACOL) produced a document “designed to provide states, districts, online programs, and other organizations with a set of quality guidelines for online teaching.” That document, *The National Standards for Quality Online Teaching* consists of a rating guide intended to identify high quality online courses (<http://www.inacol.org/research/nationalstandards/NACOL%20Standards%20Quality%20Online%20Teaching.pdf>).
- The seminal article by Chickering and Gamson, *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* has been used as a guide to good practice in thousands of college classrooms. Chickering and Ehrmann, in *Implementing The Seven Principles: Technology as Lever* showed how the seven principles could be implemented in a technology-rich environment (<http://www.tltgroup.org/programs/seven.html>).
- The University of Miami’s *Good Practices in Teaching with Technology* (http://www6.miami.edu/UMH/CDA/UMH_Main/0,1770,2666-1;3212-3,00.html).
- Quality Matters (QM) is a faculty-centered, peer review process designed to certify the quality of online courses and online components. (<http://qminstitute.org/home/Public%20Library/About%20QM/RubricStandards2008-2010.pdf>)
- Ensuring The Appropriate use Of Educational Technology: An Update For Local Academic Senates. The Academic Senate For California Community Colleges. [ATC educational tech asccc.pdf](#)
- Georgia Southern University Center For Online Learning. <http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/col/id/>
- 2010 Blackboard Exemplary Course Program Rubric. <http://kb.blackboard.com/display/EXEMPLARY/Exemplary+Course+Program>
- Sunal, D.W., Sunal, C.S., Odell, M.R., Sundberg, C.A. *Research-Supported Best Practices for Developing Online Learning*. Journal of Interactive Online Learning. <http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/pdf/2.1.1.pdf>