

Mendocino College Academic Senate
MINUTES
Thursday, February 23, 2017
12:30p.m. – 2:00p.m., Room 4210

- Call to order* President Edington called the meeting to order at 12:30p.m.
- Present* Jordan Anderson, Maria Cetto, Jessica Crofoot, Jason Davis, Jason Edington, Catherine Indermill, Conan McKay, Tascha Whetzel, Vivian Varela
- Absent* Doug Browe
- Recorder* Catherine Indermill (with Jason Davis)
- Agenda Approval* **M/S/C (Varela / McKay) to approve the agenda as amended:**
- Change “12:30a.m. to 12:30p.m.
- Minutes Approval* **M/S/C (Varela / McKay) to approve the minutes of January 26, 2017 and February 9, 2017 18, 2016.** One minor correction was noted on page 2 the word “sue” should be “sure”. There was no other discussion: None.
Yeas: unanimous
- Public Comment* Senator Varela mentioned that President Trump has recently rescinded an Executive Order, effectively banning transgendered students from using the bathroom of their choice and asked if the Academic Senate can address this as it relates to Resolutions F’16-01 and F’16-02
- Reports* **President’s Report:** Edington handed out and discussed a written report (attachment #1).
- Senator’s Report:** Part-Time Faculty: Crofoot reported that MPFA will begin negotiations in March; typically, the process begins during the Fall semester.
- Action Items / Old Business* **1. Accreditation Midterm Report – Second Reading:** Edington projected the report indicating the first reading occurred on 2.23.2017.
M/S/C (Varela/McKay) to accept the ACCJC Midterm Report.
Unanimous.
Discussion included:
- McKay thanked Interim VPES Polak for her work on preparing the report and getting it to the Academic Senate in a timely fashion for our review and input
 - Varela added that Polak stepped into the process mid-stream and

her thorough work is reflected in the completeness and detail in the report

- Whetzel indicated there are still some questions about explanations of processes in the report and if they are occurring as stated. Further are things actually occurring as written. She said some of the report does not seem completely accurate. Edington said he thought the content of the report were satisfactory, as they represent the “spirit” of our processes. Indermill added, as was discussed during the first reading that the Academic Senate President’s signature indicates “participation” in the review. This does not mean that the Academic Senate agrees with the content or is certifying its accuracy.
- Edington added that having the Academic Senate review the Midterm Report is a good starting point so senators are aware of it. He clarified that Academic Senate President signs (as well as other constituent leaders) not for accuracy and completeness, but to verify Senate was involved in the process, this was an important distinction that was made at the last meeting

2. Distance Education Committee Recommendation: Edington projected the recommendation from the Distance Education Committee submitted by Distance Education Coordinator, Varela (attachment #2) and thanked the committee for its work on this project.

M/S/C (Anderson/Cetto) to accept the Distance Education Committee’s recommendation for Canvas Training. Yeas: Anderson, Cetto, Crofoot, Davis, Indermill, Varela, Whetzel. No: McKay
Discussion included:

- Indermill asked for clarification on the following points, all of which Varela confirmed:
 1. Previously the required training for the use of Etudes, was a requirement of Etudes, not Mendocino College, correct?
Varela answered, stating that Etudes required Faculty using their platform to receive their training, but Canvas does not have such a requirement
 2. In December, the action of the Academic Senate to “require” training for faculty who have never taught on-line is a “locally controlled” decision, this is not a requirement of Canvas
 3. The recommendation for consideration today, that training of faculty who want to use Canvas for on-the-ground is recommended, but not required is also under “local control” and not mandated by Canvas
- Indermill added that considering the Academic Senate decisions regarding Canvas training are not mandated by an outside agency and are, in fact, locally controlled, means we should formalize this

recommendation. Even if the Academic Senate say this is required it doesn't necessarily mean we can enforce it, therefore at this point we need to write a resolution to be addressed with the Administration

- Anderson and Crofoot agreed a Resolution is called for
- McKay expressed concern about ADA compliance in our on-line classes and suggested a means to rectify this was through mandatory Canvas training for all users of Canvas
- There were some additional comments about ADA/508 compliance and the importance of these issues in our on-line, as well as on-the-ground classes. A lengthy discussion followed about the various issues associated with ADA compliance and available training. This is an important issue for all classes that we should be addressing faculty-wide, not necessarily just for Canvas users. Varela indicated that required training for all classes is not practical:
 - We do not have the human resources to do this
 - Not practical to ask PT faculty to complete a four-week training without compensation
 - The plan is to provide Canvas shells to every class taught beginning in the Fall
 - She added that it is not within the DE Committees purview to address ADA compliance
 - If ADA training is required for all full and part-time faculty using Canvas for F2F and online classes, it is not possible to do
 - Whetzel noted ADA and 508 compliance are being mixed up and referenced inaccurately. Indermill asked if she could present a clarification at a future meeting
 - Edington suggested a Resolution that addresses ADA training

3. April Faculty Meeting: Edington noted a need to re-address the Faculty Meeting scheduled in April

M/S/ (Anderson/Cetto) to move the April Faculty Meeting per discussion.

Edington said the previously scheduled Faculty Meeting on 4/6 was rescheduled to 4/27; however, neither of these dates work because there are Academic Senate meetings on both days. Further, 4/13 is during Spring Break and 4/20 conflicts with Plenary. So, three options proposed by Edington are:

1. Forgo an April Faculty Meeting
2. Schedule one for Thursday, March 30
3. First Thursday in May (the fourth)

The second and third options mean there will be two meetings in either March or April.

Discussion included:

- Suggesting a March meeting because as there are many things going on and it would be better to meet sooner; if something else comes up we can schedule an addition meeting in May if necessary
- Important to have a faculty meeting Prior to the BOT April meeting
- Whetzel agreed, adding we should not drop a meeting

M/S/C (Anderson/Indermill) to schedule the Faculty Meeting on March 30. Unanimous

4. Faculty Meeting Assignments: Edington introduced the agenda item indicating we need to designate Senators to run the remaining Faculty Meetings for the remainder of the year. A brief discussion ensued about various availability of the Senators to run the Faculty Meeting.

M/S/C (Indermill/Whetzel): To assign Anderson/Indermill to March 16, McKay/Indermill to March 30, and Edington take May 18. Unanimous

*Discussion Items /
New Business*

1. 2016-2017 Goals - Updates: Edington introduced the agenda item indicating it is time to address the Academic Senate Goals for the year to see where we are and what we need to work on. His intention was to have someone assigned to the Goals that are not currently being looked at by the end of the meeting. He began by providing an overview of each of the Goals (attachment #3):

1. Committees – Look to consolidate, streamline, and update to include staggered staffing: Edington is working on putting together a list of all committees and is thinking about sending to it to all faculty to ask what committees they might like to serve on in the future. This will help him understand the staging of faculty on each committee. He thinks the staging for Part-time faculty on committees is taken care of

1.a Scheduling of Committees and faculty schedules – college hour:

Edington said that College Hour – will be discussed at the next Academic Senate Meeting. It has been discussed briefly in Enrollment Management Committee and was announced at the last faculty meeting that this needs to be clarified, in terms of the “purpose” and designated time

1.b. Consistent guidelines for having applicants volunteer for committees (FT and PT): Edington said no work is happening on this

1.c. Keen attention paid to Professional Development/Flex/Professional Leave, and to getting PD to work: Edington said he has been working on this by requesting equal constituent representation on the committee. He asked Indermill (as a faculty member, at large) to join this committee) at the beginning of the year to volunteer for this committee and requested an additional classified representative be appointed. The committee has not met since early in the year. He has discussed with the committee members the idea of streamlining Flex and Professional Development Leave with the Professional Development Committee. He

will bring this idea to the next Academic Senate Meeting for discussion

2. *Investigate and recommend actions with regard to administrative workload of faculty:* Edington said nothing is being done on this goal

3. *Investigate hiring policies, practices, and training for hiring committees, including the role of the faculty chair on hiring committees:* Edington said he has a meeting scheduled with There, Interim VPESSE Polak, Director of Human Relations, Myer and Indermill (3/1) to initiate a discussion about hiring practices. Edington said he has discussed the Administrative Procedure with Myer, adding that some issues were raised by faculty and hiring was mentioned in the May 2016 Faculty Survey

4. *Investigate and Possibly Implement Electronic Voting for the Senate:* Edington said he asked McKay to explore this voting option with ASCCC to see if it is “legal, etc.” Currently, Part-time faculty employ electronic voting. The reason to consider electronic voting is there are faculty who are mostly “off-site” and cannot come to the Ukiah Campus to cast votes. Indermill noted that California Federation of Teachers have established guidelines that can be used by Union Locals. This information should be available in the MCFT Archives for us to review. Edington said he is continuing to work on this.

5. *Investigate and Recommend Open Educational Resources and Zero Cost Degrees:* The Academic Senate is not working on this. Edington said that President Reyes is interested in the idea (and wants a Department to offer a Zero-Cost Degree) and that there is Grant money available for bring in a specialist to discuss Low- No-Cost Degrees. Discussion included the questions about compensating faculty who research this etc. for their Department. If there is money available to pay faculty to work on such a project. Edington thought there might be, but the intent of this Goal is to ask these types of question and gather information about this area.

6. *Investigate and report back on issues surrounding Dual Enrollment:* Edington said he believes this Goal was accomplished because Interim VPESSE made a presentation to the Academic Senate about this last Fall. He specially asked Senators Crofoot and Whetzel their interpretation as to the completion they had raised questions about Dual Enrollment in the past:

- Crofoot said to her knowledge it is still an ongoing issue in terms of general confusion about the processes and concerns about hiring faculty, rigor, and the specifics as outline in Goal 6. A – D. She added she has seen fliers at Ukiah High School advertising College classes taught by a high school teacher, which is a concern,
- Whetzel agrees the Senate was provided the information about the differences between dual and concurrent enrollments. Perhaps we need to check in with faculty who had expressed concerns about these type of classes to ensure they understand the differences, know how these classes are chosen to be scheduled, and know how faculty and locations are determined,

Crofoot and Whetzel agreed to Edington’s request to serve on an Ad Hoc committee to investigate this further.

7. *Investigate and implement methods to increase communication and awareness of issues with faculty:*

7.a. *Includes cleaning up the agendas and minutes on the website / portal for all planning/participatory governance committees:* Edington stated this includes updating the agendas and minutes for all participatory governance committees on the Portal. He said he has been working on posting the Academic Senate's agendas and minutes. Recently PBC sent out an agenda campus-wide.

7.b. *Need to also address the new initiatives and software college is using, including how E-Lumen will help with Program Review:* Edington said this needs to be done,

7.c. *Suggest creating an Ad hoc committee for this:* Edington said this needs to be done,

7.d. *Invite a member of key committees to report to the senate at least annually, including: Professional Development, Equity, Distance Education, Foundational Skills, SSSP, SLOT, Curriculum, and Flex:* Edington said about one third of our committees have made presentations to the Academic Senate. Foundational Skills will be scheduled soon. The following committees have made presentations: Equity, Student Learning Outcome Team, and Distance Education. Edington noted that nothing is happening with the Professional Development Committee and it needs to meet before he can make a report.

Additional discussion and questions related to Goal #7 included:

- Are the participatory governance committees the seven mentioned in the Midterm Report? Edington answered: Yes, "at a minimum" and he would like all committees that have faculty assigned to them by the Academic Senate post agendas and minutes on the Portal.
- Who "polices" this? It is out-of-date and/or non-existent for many committees,
- How does this information (agendas and minutes) get out from the Academic Senate discussion to the faculty and/or committee chairs for it to actually happen?
- What are the expected timelines for information to be posted?
- The Portal is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. Edington said the new Portal should resolve some of these issues.
- Is the Academic Senate asking the Committee Chair to do these tasks or the faculty members on the committees? Edington said the Chairs should do this, and then asking the faculty on the committees if it is happening. But this discussion is about planning and developing an Ad Hoc Committee to address this (or the Senate as a whole).

Edington suggested the next step for the meeting was to ask Senators to volunteer to work on Goals to help us move forward.

- Goal 6 was addressed during the review (noted above), Crofoot and Whetzel will work on this Goal.

- 1.B. – in an attempt to assign this Goal to a Senator a number of additional questions were raised, including:
 - What is meant by varying amounts of work is required for various committees?
 - Are we talking about the establishment of guidelines for volunteers to follow?
 - Is this about how the Academic Senate Appoints Faculty to committees?
 - All faculty are required to serve on committees as per the Full-time Collective Bargaining Agreement,
 - Some people have served on committees for many years and others may wish to do so, but feel they can't,
 - Do we have or have we considered “term-limits” so we can have new people contribute or is consistency important for some committees?
- In the consideration of time, Edington asked if Senators would volunteer to work on any of the Goals and limit additional discussion:
 - McKay and Anderson volunteered for Goal 5
 - Crofoot volunteered for 1.b.
- Edington asked the Senators to think about these and get back to him with what they can help with. Indermill suggested that Senators review the August Academic Senate Minutes to refresh our memories as to what these Goals are intended to address. She said with the amount of time that has passed without discussion it may be difficult to remember what these entail and that we should discuss further before Ad Hoc Committees were formed to deal with the issues. Edington concurred. He will put such a discussion on a future agenda.

2. PBC Representative: Edington projected Academic Senate Constitution Article IV Section 5 (attachment #4) which states that the Academic Senate Vice President serve as a voting member of the Planning and Budgeting Committee. It is not possible for Indermill to attend these meetings for the remainder of the semester (three meeting: March, April and May) as they conflict with one of her classes. Edington said he'd like to see if a Senator can attend these meetings on her behalf. Questions included:

- Will the Senator be a voting member of PBC? Edington answered: the current practice with PBC is decisions are made by way of consensus. If you can do this, you'd be carrying a “proxy vote” for the Vice President.
- Is it possible that a Senator would participate and vote at PBC “for or against” what Indermill would have voted herself? Indermill commented the difficulty of a “proxy vote” is that there is not process established to address this. Further, regardless if the committee makes decisions by consensus or a vote, the role of the Academic Senate President and Vice President's on PBC is to represent the faculty at large. Many of the times, we know the position of the faculty and can represent it. Other times, we need to go back to faculty and ask what

- position they want us to take, on their behalf.
- Indermill said we do not have anything in the Constitution to address a committee absence, such as this, and she recommended a Senator serve on the committee in her place.
 - General discussion about Senators availability, compensation, potential conflicts followed with no specific direction or volunteer named,
 - Why hasn't the meeting time been adjusted? Other committees do so for such conflicts (particularly with a key member of the committee). Edington answered that there are many "moving parts" and has been at this time for a while.
 - PBC meet earlier in the week. Edington was asked if it was noted by PBC the reason for Indermill's absence and was there a discussion about faculty representation in her absence? Edington answered that the reason for the absence was noted, but not discussed. He added he spoke privately with Reyes about it. Indermill added that the discussion should occur at PBC for their input, as they may not support a substitute committee member. If this is acceptable, we should ask Senators to volunteer to take this on and then add it to an Academic Senate agenda as an action item to make the appointment.

3. Review and Discussion of Hiring Practices – BP 7120 and AP 701.1

Edington indicated there was not enough time for discussion of this item (attachment #5), but asked Senators to discuss it with their constituents. Specifically, he asked Senators to solicit feedback about recent hiring committees. What issues and/or concerns have come up regarding the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure and their experience on these hiring committees? Also, he asked that the BP and AP be reviewed in general. He said this will help prepare for additional rounds of faculty hiring (particularly this semester). Issues the Senators noted included:

- A need for clarification on the role and designated disciple of the Faculty Co-Chair,
- A need for consistent training for members of the committee in all aspects of the process,

Open Forum

- McKay announced there is a Free Part-time Faculty Institute on August 4 and 5 in Anaheim and asked if we can use Academic Senate funds to cover travel costs for interested participants.
- Crofoot asked if employment notifications have been sent to all employee groups. Edington said he has not been aware of the status of this.

Meeting adjourned at 2:11pm

Attachment #1

ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

February 23, 2017

Respectfully submitted by Jason Edington, Academic Senate President

1. PBC Report

Eileen took us through the proposed 2017-2018 Governor's Budget. Highlights include:

- 1.48% COLA on Revenue (~300k to Mendocino College) and DSPS, EOPS, CalWORKS
- 23.5 million base increase (~81k to Mendocino College)
- No one time discretionary funding
- \$150 million for Guided Pathways (unknown amount for Mendocino College)
- 3.1 million increase to Full Time Student Success Grant Program
- No change to other categoricals (SSSP, Equity, Adult Ed, Strong Workforce)

PBC received the recommendation from EAP on the Football Program. While there was some discussion of voting today, I urged PBC to allow time for the recommendation to be sent out to all constituent groups. President Reyes agreed, but also reminded PBC that it is possible that the BOT would take action on the item at their March meeting.

The impact of the new positions on our 2017-2018 budget were discussed. The original number discussed in PBC in the fall was \$450k for new salaries from the general college budget, and this number has now grown to \$731k.

The VP of Student Services position was approved. Much discussion focused on how information needs to be better communicated, including the new funding guidelines from the Chancellor's office. It was suggested that we all work together to find a way to ensure that questions and concerns are able to be addressed by the people that know the answers, and President Reyes suggested that in the future we might consider inviting the VP's to at least part of our constituent meetings to be on hand to answer questions.

The ACCJC midterm report was presented to PBC as well. The other items on the agenda were not covered as we ran out of time.

2. Meeting with President Reyes to discuss Letter to Newspaper and February 8 Board Report

Catherine and I met with President Reyes on 2/13 and focused on three questions.

1) What would you like us to tell the faculty about the decision to communicate with the press, while the decision was still in process?

President Reyes stated that the purpose of the letter was to clarify the college process, which it did for the community. He further stated that he has no control over the article, and was unsure how the letter led them to the headline that was stated.

President Reyes stated also that the board suggested that he should share the information on the process so that the public would understand it better.

2) What would you like us to tell the faculty about the decision not to send the letter to the college employees at the same time?

President Reyes stated that this was a mistake and that this should have happened. He takes full responsibility for this. This was the first time that he had written a letter to the editor – noting that usually we use Press Releases and that these *are* sent out to all employees on campus. In the future he assured us that the protocol for Press Releases would be followed for letters to the editor such as this.

3) From the faculty point of view, there was a mischaracterization your February Board Report. Specifically the statement of faculty appreciating ‘being heard on this matter’ vis-à-vis the VP Reorganization. Faculty do not feel heard. What would you like to communicate back to the faculty about this.

President Reyes pointed out that, from his perspective on things, faculty have been heard. There have been three forums, discussion at two PBC meetings, letters were sent to the board, some faculty have discussed it directly with him, there have been two board meetings (if faculty wished to speak during public comment), and a special faculty/classified joint meeting which was attended by both Vice Presidents.

There was some further discussion on what it means to be ‘heard’. I posited that it does not mean being in the room while discussion is happening, nor does it mean that the group being heard has to ‘have their way else they do not feel heard.’ Rather, being heard is collegial, and means being considered. I further pointed out that some of the decisions lately have a feel that they are a ‘done deal’ by the time we hear about them. President Reyes agreed that we need to find a better way to communicate information earlier to ensure that this perception, which he states is not the reality, is

avoided in the future.

Attachment #2

Presented to Academic Senate Friday, October 7, 2016

After review and much discussion, the Distance Education Committee would like to recommend that the Academic Senate consider adopting the following procedure as support for all faculty using the new Learning Management System (LMS), Canvas.

Canvas training for faculty has two different types of courses: a Canvas Basics 2-week course (approximately 6-12 hours) designed for currently teaching online faculty and a 4-week Introduction to Canvas course (approximately 40 hours) from @One designed for brand new online faculty. The @One course includes Canvas basics and appropriate pedagogy for teaching online.

For the first time, the college has the opportunity to provide access to the LMS to all faculty, including on-campus classes, web-enhanced, hybrid, and fully online instruction. It is the advice of the DE Committee to require all faculty to take the two week Canvas Basics course before using Canvas in the classroom as the college implements the new LMS. We see this as a pilot and will be collecting input from faculty regarding the effectiveness of the training as a support for classroom usage. A final recommendation on training will be made to the Academic Senate after the fall semester startup has been completed.

Recommendation Presenting to the Academic Senate Thursday, February 9, 2017

After reviewing the Canvas Usage Survey from participants in three Canvas training courses, the Distance Education Committee would like to recommend that the mandatory training for faculty **only** using Canvas to support their face-to-face classes instead be recommended. Additionally, we propose putting together smaller self-paced courses on specific tools of Canvas for interested faculty to review as needed. The requirements for faculty teaching online courses will remain the same as previously established: faculty who have never taught online must take the four-week training course Introduction to Canvas course (approximately 40 hours) or show certification of completing a similar training using the Canvas LMS, faculty who have taught online using other LMSs must take the two-week Canvas Basics class (approximately 6-12 hours).

Vivian Varela
Distance Education Coordinator, Chair Distance Education Committee

Canvas Usage Survey

10 out of 42 active participants in the three trainings
Two 2-week sessions + One 4-week session

1: I have taken the 2-week Canvas Basics course

Yes 3 No 5

2: I have taken the 4-week Introduction to Canvas course (either from Mendocino College or directly

from @One).

Yes 6 No 3

3: What is your previous history of use of a Learning Management System (LMS)?

0-2 years supporting face-to-face classroom instruction 3 responses

more than 2 years using a LMS in both modes of instruction 1 response

0-2 years teaching online only 1 response

more than 2 years supporting face-to-face classroom instruction 3 responses

0-2 years using a LMS in both modes of instruction 1 response

4: Which of the following Canvas features do you anticipate using as part of your face-to-face classroom? (Pick all that apply)

Syllabus, Announcements, Discussions, Assignments

Syllabus, Announcements, Discussions, Grades

Syllabus, Announcements, Modules, Discussions, Assignments, Grades

Syllabus, Announcements, Modules, Discussions, Assignments, Quizzes, Grades, Chat, Pages, Files, Collaborations

Assignments, Grades, Pages, Files

Syllabus, Announcements, Discussions, Assignments, Quizzes, Chat, Files, Polls, Collaborations

Syllabus, Announcements, Discussions, Assignments, Grades, Files

Syllabus, Announcements, Modules, Assignments, Grades

Syllabus, Announcements, Modules, Discussions, Assignments, Quizzes, Grades, Pages, Files

5: Do you currently use Etudes/Canvas to support your face-to-face classes?

Yes 1 No 8

6: Do you currently use the Portal to support your face-to-face classes?

Yes 4 No 5

7: How can the college best support you in using Canvas for your face-to-face classes? (Example: training on xyz)

- Make Canvas available to everyone teaching online or face-to-face classes. The 2-week training class was very helpful.
- Discussion and grade training
- I do not have this answer at this time, because we are so new to the program as instructors and the college as a whole. It is going to take trial and error to find which parts of the program are most user friendly and applicable to our full course and short term courses. I personally, do not have an immediate need for my short term 4-week course. It is mainly discussion and hands-on activities that students have to appear to the class for credit. At a later time, should the college choose to convert it to an online course, I will gladly take on the Canvas Online instructor's version. It can be instructed as face-to-face and online.

For my full semester course, I will have to try out the course and find out the needs during this first introduction of BUS 107 into our course offerings. I am sure I will be able to assess the benefits and non-benefits of having Canvas as an option.

In regards to instruction in-class and Canvas simultaneously for instructors with more than 2 courses, I believe that it will be more challenging for the instructors. Canvas opens another door and requires an instructor to be on-call most of the time, unless clear definitions of the online office hours are clarified in the syllabus. For myself, if in this specific situation, I would definitely set up specific guidelines for the course in regards to instructor Q & A, online office hours,

response times, and student-to-student group discussion panels. It would also be important to have a strict definition of attendance and testing options, so that students understand that Canvas is an option for these 2 specific items when a student is absolutely unable to attend class or testing days; including amount of days that can be missed, etc. (Special learning and physical disabilities will always be taken as a priority in the instructor/student decision making processes.)

I'm sure there are other items that will come about, but until we have more input from other instructors as well as students, we will have to learn as we go.

- Since I am so new at this, I can't answer. Ask again at the end of spring semester!
- I think that an optional two-week training would suffice.
- Give us the links to the available training online and offer periodic classes introducing canvas. Also please for LOVE OF ALL THAT IS HOLY WHY IS THE LINK TO CANVAS NOT A HUGE BUTTON ON THE MAIN COLLEGE PAGE??!!! It makes zero sense to have it on the library website!
- Many of my courses are "stacked" with multiple sections. I need to be able to have ONE Canvas shell for these stacked classes instead of several.
- As we are going hybrid next semester, and this is the first time for me to do so, it will be important to have a liaison that I can turn to for questions about Canvas. Please clarify for us if that will be Vivian or the department chair, for instance. For the classroom time, I will still set up assignments into Canvas so the students can see the semester laid out.

8: How can the college best support you in using Canvas for your online classes? (example: training on xyz)

- Provide ample time to learn Canvas. It's pretty intuitive but everyone should have access to a Sandbox well in advance of any teaching assignment.
- Discussion and grade training
- I am not sure at this time with exception to having a Canvas trained individual on our campus that we can connect and communicate with in regards to IT and instructional assistance. Both online and face-to-face course instructors will need this assistance at some point and having an immediate answer can be very reassuring! I do recall that Canvas has a 24/7 type of assistance service, an added plus to the program.
- I do not yet have an on-line class. Since taking the four week Canvas class, I am surprised to realize that I would be interested in teaching one!
- I think that the four week training should be required for instructors who wish to teach an online class. That is the reason I took the four-week training, and I found it very beneficial and insightful.
- Same as above!
- Haven't taught that way yet so can't say.
- Even though I have worked with Canvas for over a year, we are going hybrid next semester, and this is the first time for me to do that. It will be important to have a liaison that I can turn to for questions with the Canvas online portion. Please clarify for us if that will be Vivian or the department chair, for instance. I like the idea that this person would also have access to my class initially to make sure I am doing things properly.

9: In your professional opinion, should the 2-week Canvas Basics training be mandatory for instructors wishing to use the LMS for face-to-face classes only? Explain your opinion.

- I wouldn't say "mandatory" is necessary. The interface is pretty intuitive. All instructors should be given access to a Sandbox, in my opinion, to see how Canvas could support face-to-face instruction. Also, if Best Practices or practice sites could be shared with everyone, this could help give people a better idea of how to use Canvas in their classrooms. Thanks.
- So far, I am inclined to think that Canvas is not as flexible as Etudes: 1) The Home page design capability seems less by a good chunk of that of Etudes; 2) Ditto the PM function on Etudes vs. that of Canvas
- Yes, I do believe that having the 2-week Canvas Basics training should be mandatory. There are items that an instructor might miss while trying to learn on their own that can be very useful to both the student and the instructor and their communications; like that of publishing and not publishing, various chat/discussion options, grading rubrics, quiz options, and open/closed time frame on assignments in their modules. There are other items as well, but these are the first of which that I remember having to revisit for clarification during my 4-week Canvas course.
- Yes. I suspect resistance is about fear of technology and Canvas being "new". Without the class I would never have taken the time to explore and learn the system.
- Yes - the course does not take up too much time and provides a good overview of the LMS in a structured way. It might be nice if there was some compensation for the time spent (or to be able to use flex hours?)
- I do not think it necessary to require training for faculty who wish to use Canvas only to support their face-to-face classes. If instructors are only using Canvas to support their face-to-face classes, there will obviously be varying levels of "usage" among instructors. For example, some instructors may wish only to upload files for students, and in this case, it wouldn't really be any different than using the portal, and there was no training required to use the portal. In my opinion, an optional training would suffice for this. I do think that training is beneficial for those wanting to get more in depth in their use of Canvas, but not all instructors may wish to do so.
- ABSOLUTELY NOT!!! The training was basically unhelpful. I figured everything out by googling it! There is literally NOTHING that I learned in the 4 WEEK training I could not have figured out for myself using the internet or which could not have been taught in a 2 hr training course at the library! Since there is 24/7 support available just require instructors to use that instead of harassing Vivian and Dave, but don't make it extra hard for instructors to get access to this AWESOME TOOL for teaching!!!!
- No. I have used Learning Management systems at three other schools for face-to-face classes and never had to go through a training. I had access to tech support and watched a few instructional videos. That was all I needed.
- Although I have used Canvas for over a year at another college, I found the two week course beneficial because I have not had to build a class before (my director has built the programs I am teaching there).
Since I will be building my class for next semester here at Mendocino, the Canvas learning guide is important. I don't think the two-week training should be necessary if for face-to-face classes only - as long as the instructor has access to the basic training guide for reference.

The survey results show five faculty saying that mandatory training for on-campus only faculty was not necessary and three were in favor of maintaining mandatory training.

Attachment #3

Senate Goals for 2016-2017:

Approved 8/18/16

1. Committees – Look to consolidate, streamline, and update to include staggered staffing {4,5,6,7,8,9 & 10}
 - a. Scheduling of Committees and faculty schedules – college hour – moving around committees to allow others to participate
 - b. Consistent guidelines for having applicants volunteer for committees (FT and PT)
 - c. Keen attention paid to Professional Development/Flex/Professional Leave, and to getting PD to work.
2. Investigate and recommend actions with regard to administrative workload of faculty {6, 7 & 10}
3. Investigate hiring policies, practices, and training for hiring committees, including the role of the faculty chair on hiring committees. {6, 10}
4. Investigate and possibly implement a process for electronic voting for Senate. {6, 11}
5. Investigate and Recommend Open Educational Resources and Zero Cost Degrees. {4, 5, 8, 10}
6. Investigate and report back on issues surrounding Dual Enrollment {4, 5, 10}
 - a. Liability
 - b. Mandated Reporting
 - c. How are instructors being hired/paid/evaluated?
 - d. Form an Ad hoc committee
7. Investigate and implement methods to increase communication and awareness of issues with faculty. {6, 7, 8, 9, 10}
 - a. Includes cleaning up the agendas and minutes on the website/portal for all planning/participatory governance committees.
 - b. Need to also address the new initiatives and software college is using, including how E-Lumen will help with Program Review.
 - i. Stay on top of working with administration to make program review more meaningful.
 - c. Suggest creating an Ad hoc committee for this.

- d. Invite a member of key committees to report to the senate at least annually, including: Professional Development, Equity, Distance Education, Foundational Skills, SSSP, SLOT, Curriculum, and Flex.

Ongoing matters:

1. Continue to support effective communication & collaboration between faculty & administration / management. Identify potential points of friction and possible solutions. Communicate faculty support for administration as applicable. {11}
2. Review state-of-the-college with regard to SLOs, PSLOs & ISLOs {1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10}
3. Review Constitution &/or Bylaws (annually) {11 & all}
4. Follow progress and discussions occurring in key faculty committees & provide time in AS meetings for regular reports from key committees. {6, 7, 8, 9, 10}
5. Review Equivalency Procedures {6 & 7}
6. Support continued representation & involvement of our local AS at statewide level {8 & 10}

Attachment #4

Article IV

Section 5. DUTIES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Vice-President shall:

- A. Act as President in the absence of that officer.
- B. Succeed to the Presidency in the event of a mid-term vacancy of that office.
- C. Serve as a voting member of the PBC (Planning and Budgeting Committee) or other designated institutional decision-making body.
- D. Serve on the Educational Action Plan committee.
- E. Perform such functions as the President assigns to assist in carrying out the purposes and policies of the Academic Senate.

Attachment #5

https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/BOT/Policies/bp7120_.pdf

<https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/BOT/Procedures/ap701.1.pdf>

--- end ---