

Mendocino College Academic Senate
MINUTES
Thursday, February 9, 2017
12:30p.m. – 2:00p.m., Room 4210

- Call to order* President Edington called the meeting to order at 12:34p.m.
- Present* Jordan Anderson Maria Cetto, Jessica Crofoot, Jason Edington, Catherine Indermill, Conan McKay, Tascha Whetzel, Vivian Varela
- Absent* Doug Browe, Jason Davis
- Others* Leslie Banta, Debra Polak
- Recorder* Catherine Indermill
- Agenda Approval* **M/S/C (McKay / Crofoot) to approve the agenda**
- Minutes Approval* **M/S/C (Varela/Anderson) to approve the minutes of November 29, 2016 and December 6, 2016.**
Edington noted the minutes for January 26, 2017 were not available. When asked where we are in terms of obtaining a regular note-taker, Edington responded that progress has not been made on this on-going issue. Yeas: Cetto, Crofoot, Indermill, McKay, Whetzel, Varela; Abstention: Anderson.
- Public Comment* Leslie Banta read a comment from herself and Sue Blundell (attachment #1) and indicated she thought others would join in adding their names as they had expressed similar concerns but were not able to get back to her in time for the meeting. General concerns centered on the thought that the Academic Senate is being too “reactive” and not “proactive” with campus issues that directly affect the faculty (including the proposed administrative reorganization, the situation with the Football program, K-12 enrollment, Middle College). It is requested that the Academic Senate become more “proactive” and less “passive”.
- Reports* **President’s Report:** Edington provided a written report (attachment #2) and discussed the five areas he addressed in the report.
1. Board Resolution: Edington indicated he has sent an email requesting a meeting between himself, Indermill (AS VP), President Reyes and Interim VP/ESS Polak to begin the “meet and confer” process on the two resolutions approved by the Academic Senate last December, but has not yet had a reply.
2. Faculty/Classified Meeting: Edington noted a successful meeting was held with members of the Classified Staff and Faculty to discuss the proposed administrative re-organization. A few topics/questions came up

during the first half of the meeting that were asked of VP Cichocki and Polak when they arrived during the second half hour. Edington pointed out that Cichocki and Polak agreed some information was missing in the proposal presented. He also noted an important theme was that Student Services Personnel be involved in the discussions regarding support staff and since this meeting Cichocki has scheduled a meeting with the Classified Senate Representative to discuss this matter.

3. Classified Student Equity ~~Plan~~ Work: Edington noted this correction (“Plan” should be “Work”) in the sub-title of this paragraph. He noted the Classified Staff have been working with CUE to develop an Action Plan related to the areas listed in his report. The question was raised about how classified staff were chosen for this project. Edington indicated he was not sure, but thought it had been by “invitation” and will follow up with the answer. The Classified Staff developed the various work areas listed in this President’s Report and Edington indicated he has been a part of these work groups.

4. Middle College Update: Edington indicated at the next Ukiah Unified School District Board meeting they will plan to make one of the following decisions regarding their movement on Middle College – to “green light” the project in Fall 2017, Fall of 2018 or “be done with it”. The following discussion and questions ensued:

- If the decision is to move ahead in Fall 2017, what does that mean for us (Mendocino College) – what are our next steps? Edington answered that an MOU is being drafted;
- If UUSD Board approves the “green light” for Fall 2017 or 2018 does that imply MC agree?
- Where are we (faculty) in this process? Where is the faculty input? It appears this is not in the Academic Senate’s purview to “sign off”;
- Where did the list of potential classes for UUSD students come from? Edington indicated that Debra and Rebecca put it together as a sample, and UUSD has created a draft of an Education Plan for the UUSD students;
- Will these high school students have priority registration over other MC students? Edington indicated he “miscommunicated” this point previously and they will receive the no priority, the same as other k-12 students;
- This “program” influences current and prospective students as well as faculty and needs active involvement of the faculty in the decision making about the processes involved and any MOU;
- Two members of the Academic Senate (Anderson and Indermill) were

invited to help draft an MOU with UUSD in December, at this meeting an MOU was *not* discussed and Anderson/Indermill raised various question about the impact of Middle College on Mendocino College students, faculty, facilities, etc. which have not been addressed.

- It was asked if other faculty have not been included in additional discussions about the process. Edington indicated he had participated in the most recent meeting about the progress of Middle College;
- Anderson and Indermill said they had not participated in talks since December, 2016 and asked if it was because of the questions they raised (not due to opposition) – Edington indicated this was not the case;
- Edington clarified that high school students participating in this program would not have priority registration privileges ahead of current MC students;
- The question was raised about where we (the District) are in this process – Edington answered that the Academic Senate is not required to “sign off” on this. Indermill noted that we (Academic Senate) should be actively involved.

5. Academic Ranking: Edington mentioned that he had met with Dan Jenkins to develop an alternate plan for establishing Academic Ranks. Discussion included various questions about why this was occurring:

- Has the Academic Senate and/or Faculty discussed a need to address changes in the process? What is the impetus for changing the process? Why is this occurring now when there are other issues we are facing that need attention?
 - Edington answered by saying the intent is to create a more “developmental pathway” to establish rank rather than a “time-line approach”. There was interest by Jenkins to link ranks more closely with required professional development and this was a way to encourage more professional development activities. This has been on the Academic Senate “topic for future meetings” list since last year, so Edington pursued it.
- It was noted that these are honorary titles. They do not provide additional compensation or status. So why make it more challenging and laborious for faculty to obtain them? If changes affect workload, the faculty unions may need to be involved. Do faculty want changes to the process?
 - Edington said he will take this to a Faculty Meeting for input and direction before additional work is done.

Senator’s Report: Crofoot mentioned an email sent by classified staff

member, Cyndi Woskow, to the constituent leaders about the proposed administrative reorganization that was well presented and on-point. She said she wanted to “acknowledge” her effort in doing so.

*Action Items /
Old Business*

1. Hiring Committee Appointments: Edington projected the names of the faculty members who had volunteered for the various committees. Highlighted in green were the names of those he suggest we appoint (attachment #3).

M/S/C (Anderson / Crofoot) to appoint Kurt Combs to the Admissions and Records hiring committee. Yeas: unanimous

M/S/C (Crofoot / McKay) to appoint Nicholas Petti to the Coast Center Operations Supervisor hiring committee. Discussion included a comment from Interim VPESSE Polak that Petti had served on the Coast Implementation Steering Committee. Yeas: unanimous

M/S/C (Whetzel / Crofoot) to appoint Alicia Mendoza and Rhea Hollis to Dean of Counseling & Student Programs hiring committee. Discussion included that Mendoza has not yet earned tenure and the Academic Senate typically does not ask these faculty members to serve on committees. Edington said he had spoken with her about this and felt this would be ok. It was noted that she presents ongoing continuity for the department. Yeas: unanimous

M/S/C (Indermill / McKay) to appoint Steve Crossman to the Director of Special Programs hiring committee. Discussion – none. Yeas: unanimous

M/S/C (Indermill / McKay) to appoint Tascha Whetzel to the Director of Special Programs hiring committee. Discussion – none. Yeas: unanimous

2. Committee Appointments: Edington noted need for two faculty members to replace Tascha Whetzel and Sarah Walsh.

M/S/C (Varela / Cetto) to appoint Nicholas Petti and Alicia Mendoza to the Equity Committee. Discussion included a reiteration of the concerns of non-tenured faculty members serving on committees. Yeas: unanimous

*Discussion Items /
New Business*

1. Accreditation Midterm Report – First Reading Interim VPESSE Polak introduced the agenda item. The report, sent to senators earlier in the week, is complete except for some of the documents that provide supporting evidence. These items should be added and available on the Portal by Monday, February 13. Discussion included:

- Clarification of the committee evaluation process was requested. Each committee member completes an end-of-the-year survey addressing the effective of the work completed by the committee. The committee

evaluates the survey results to determine if improvements need to be made. Polak indicated the Committee surveys for 2013-2014 were submitted to PBC and are available on the Portal. The 2014-15 surveys were not completed. The 2015-16 surveys have been completed but not submitted to PBC.

- Whetzel noted she sent questions about the Midterm Report directly to Edington and Polak, as was requested by Edington, and those questions had been answered via an email reply. Indermill noted, as a Brown Act Committee communications, such as this, need to be presented openly at the meeting. A copy of the email communication was not available at the time of the meeting for it to be read into the Minutes, so a copy will be included in the Meeting Minutes (attachment #4).
- General District Planning comes from annual Planning Workshops and the Planning and Budgeting Committee. These workshops include review and editing of the Colleges Mission, Vision and Goals etc.
- It was noted that the links in the 2014 Self-Study are not working and it does not include the effective participatory governance plan;
- Participation at the Planning Retreats are individuals from all constituent groups and include representative from the constituent leadership, PBC, EAP and some who are considered “at large”;
- Clarification of the process was requested. The Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Associated Students of Mendocino College all review the Midterm Report. Representatives from each group sign the document indicating their groups participation in the review. The signatures are not indicating certification of accuracy and content. The Midterm Report will be presented at the March Board of Trustees meeting. If accepted by the BOT it is submitted to ACCJC by March 15.

M/S/C (Crofoot / Anderson) to suspend the order of the agenda to allow time to address Discussion Item #3 Distance Education Committee Recommendations. As requested by Edington. Yeas: unanimous

3. Distance Education Committee Recommendation: Vivian Varela handed out a document (attachment #5) containing:

- 1) DE Committee Canvas Training recommendations considered by the Academic Senate on October 7, 2016,
- 2) current DE Committee recommendations for Canvas Training requirements and
- 3) the results of the Canvas Usage Survey. Varela briefly summarized these documents adding that we do not have adequate staff to provide specific Canvas Training.

The Distant Education Committee recommends faculty who plan to use Canvas in face-to-face classes, only complete a two-week self-paced course. Edington added this recommendation would come to the Academic Senate as an action item at the next meeting.

2. 2016-2017 Goals - Updates: not addressed due to lack of time.

Open Forum None, due to lack of time

Meeting adjourned at 2:08pm.

Attachment #1

We are concerned about the continued lack of both pro-active faculty involvement and communication to the faculty as a whole in the decision-making process of our college. The recent lack of such involvement in the VP re-organizing is only one example of a time when faculty were not afforded adequate and well-considered input. The fact that faculty members had to read about the possible cancellation of a campus program before hearing about it from leadership is inexcusable. The fact that many faculty showed up on campus to upset students, completely unprepared and uninformed, is indicative of the fact that current leadership does not appear to consider the faculty to be of value at Mendocino College. We have before us at least two more known issues that affect faculty– a K-12 enrollment policy (that some faculty have voiced great concern over but the Academic Senate has not addressed at a meeting) and Middle College (which has the potential to greatly affect college faculty and, again, has not been addressed by the Academic Senate in a meaningful way). There are more issues, we are sure, that we have not even heard a peep about. We respectfully request that the Academic Senate begins to take a pro-active, rather than a reactive, approach to the issues that impact our faculty and our college. The Academic Senate as a whole has had a somewhat passive approach to faculty input (through the use of email) rather than encouraging meaningful discourse at faculty or Academic Senate meetings about these types of topics or personally inviting faculty to join together to discuss areas of concern. The lack of a pro-active stance in areas such as these has the potential to continue to negatively impact faculty and appears to support the current administrative leadership in making decisions about policies and programs in an authoritarian, rather than participatory, manner.

Signed: Leslie Banta and Sue Blundell

Attachment #2

ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT’S REPORT

February 9, 2017

Respectfully submitted by Jason Edington, Academic Senate President

1. Board Resolution

I followed up with President Reyes after the last Senate meeting to ask him about why the language was changed in the Board Resolution 12-16-02, Undocumented and Documented Immigrant Students. President Reyes let me know that there are some legal requirements that we must adhere to whether we want to or not. If the Department of Education requests Student Records we must provide them. If any federal or local law enforcement agency presents a subpoena and requests student records, we must provide these. We can not refuse outright to cooperate with entities that have legal access to the student information.

The college would be insincere in stating that we are a true sanctuary where all our student will be protected from all agencies and deportation. We must abide by the local, state, and federal laws. These laws require us to share particular information with certain agencies. Plus the federal government already has a list of DACA students with college location and addresses. A sanctuary is often defined as "a sacred or holy place; a church or other sacred place where fugitives were formerly entitled to immunity from arrest; any place of refuge; asylum." When the term sanctuary is used, students may feel protected beyond any safeguards we can legally provide.

Our resolution is something that we (Catherine and I) will be meeting with President Reyes and Interim Vice President Polak to discuss as soon as we can schedule a meeting.

2. Faculty/Classified Meeting

The faculty and classified met together to discuss the VP Reorganization. There were questions and issues that came up, including:

- a. Would it be Possible to hire interim VP instead so we have time to study the reorganization
- b. The documents showing the reorganization does not have support built in
- c. What is the backup plan if the money disappears
 - i. How does this affect negotiations
- d. Classified staff feels that they are getting more duties without additional pay

Debra and Eileen came to the 2nd half of the meeting to answer questions. One of the big concerns was that this was a 'done deal', and the process in how this was done did not follow a spirit of collegiality.

3. Classified Student Equity Plan

Classified, working with CUE, have put together an action plan that focuses on five areas:

- i. Book Purchasing Assistance
- ii. Faculty Grade Submission Timing (adding Book Orders to this)
- iii. Campus, Student Services Center & Library Signage
- iv. Work Study
- v. Creating a Hub and FAQ web page for answers to common student questions

4. Middle College Update

The Board of UUSD will meet on 2/15 and they are being asked to give direction to UUSD, that will inform our process, in one of the three following directions:

- i. Begin Middle College in Fall 2017
- ii. Begin Middle College in Fall 2018
- iii. Discontinue planning for Middle College

The issues confronting UUSD's Board are financial in nature – do they have the funds to move forward on this.

If the direction is to move forward, one thing that I would like to report is that a faculty member will be on the Application Committee and on the Interview Committee.

5. Academic Ranking

I met with Dan and we began developing a plan for Academic Ranking. We expect to have a plan to bring forward in March.

Attachment #3

I have received the following volunteers for the hiring committees. My suggestions are in green:

Center of Operations Supervisor: **Nicholas Petti**, Greg Hicks, Kurt Combs
Dean of Counseling and Student Programs: Kurt Combs, Steve Crossman, **Alicia Mendoza**,
Rhea Hollis, Tascha Whetzel
Director of Special Programs: Nicholas Petti, **Steve Crossman**, **Cintya Da Cruz**, Tascha Whetzel
Admissions and Records: **Kurt Combs**

I have received the following volunteers for Student Equity: **Nicholas Petti**, **Alicia Mendoza**

Presented by Jason Edington

Attachment #4

From: Tascha Whetzel
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2017 12:47 PM
To: Debra Polak <dpolak@mendocino.edu>
Cc: Jason Edington <jedington@mendocino.edu>
Subject: mid term report

Hi Debra,

It was interesting to read the draft as I learned lots of things and remember living through some of the items too! I did have some questions. On pages 10-15, there is a description about the Institutional Effectiveness and Participatory Governance Report. I see that there are 3 sections of assessment: goals and accomplishments, committee member survey, and strategic retreat surveys. Although I am not on any of the 7 committees listed as planning committees, where were the results of all of this information shared? It reports that 2015-16 was completed. Later in the midterm report (pg48), it is reported that *"After any revisions or modifications are needed, a final draft is provided to the Planning Budgeting Committee for review of accomplishments and recommendations and official acceptance. The report is then distributed to the campus community for input and reflection."* After this section it reads that it is in process. Is this report completed each year (2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17) since the accreditation? How is it shared? Posted on the portal? At in-service? Through committees?

It looks like D. Recommendation 4- Evaluation of Participatory Governance b. Analysis/Action (page 18-22) addressed how we organize our committees so that there is balance on the 7 committees between the constituent groups. There is a reference to a new tool developed by Mendocino College to

systematically evaluate the participatory process. Apparently this is a questionnaire/survey given to the committee members. These results are summarized and given to the constituency groups who give feedback, revisions are made, given to PBC and then disseminated to the campus community. Again, how and when is this final report given to campus community? Has it happened for several years? Will there be copies of this report(s) as part of the midterm report? If it did occur, should we report the outcomes of the sharing of the information, feedback, etc.?

Thanks for the opportunity to ask questions.

Tascha Whetzel

Associate Professor
Learning Disability Specialist
Mendocino College
1000 Hensley Creek Road
Ukiah, Ca 95482
707-468-3151
twhetzel@mendocino.edu

From: Debra Polak
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2017 7:58 AM
To: Tascha Whetzel <twhetzel@mendocino.edu>
Cc: Jason Edington <jedington@mendocino.edu>; Minerva Flores <mflores@mendocino.edu>
Subject: RE: mid term report

Hi Tascha,

Sorry for the delay in answering your question more fully. I'm including Minerva in this email in case she has anything to add. My brief answer to you initially is the main answer to your question. The Institutional Effectiveness and Participatory Governance Report is reviewed through PBC and Strategic Planning Retreats. Also, it's at the Strategic Planning Retreats and through survey instruments and the committee goals sheets that the document is developed. The distribution to constituent groups is through PBC and the Institutional Researchers website. The 15-16 report has not yet been to PBC; however, Minerva has forwarded it to Arturo for a future agenda. (It was completed late fall). 14-15 is missing because this is the year we had a visit and we had to complete a 13-14 report (based on a recommendation). The 13-14 went through PBC and was posted online.

Group representation on committees is guided by the committee handbook. <https://www.mendocino.edu/college/institutional-research/committee-goals-and-descriptions>.

Thanks for reading!!

Debra Polak
Interim VP of Education and Student Services
Dean of Centers
Mendocino College

(707) 468 – 3605
dpolak@mendocino.edu

Attachment #5

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.