MINUTES

Members Present: Connie Wolfsen, Laura Mays, Ruth Moon, Sally Urban

Members Absent: Mike Peterson, Keith Snow-Flamer

1. Call to Order: Chair Wolfsen called the meeting to order at 3:07 pm.

2. Introductions and Public Comment: No comment

3. Discussion Items, Connie Wolfsen
   3.1. Draft of AP 4105 Distance Education: Mark Winter was present and gave the committee his suggestions for editing the draft of AP 4105. The first was that the language needed work, which Chair Wolfsen has noted. Professor Winter other suggestions were derived from the “Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education”, a publication of the ACCJC, which can be found on the ACCJC website. The six points given were in regards to:
   o Proctoring; Standard III, B2 states “the district will have a proctoring policy identifying acceptable methods and proctoring sites” (the July 2013 version does not state it this way).
   o Faculty and Student Evaluations: There has been a Faculty Evaluation Supplement (Schedule F-2 DE, the Supplemental Distance Education Teaching Evaluation form) that was approved by the Senate May 3, 2013 and has gone through CRFO and Administration and should be included in the next contract. Mark suggested language: “Faculty teaching online classes are systematically evaluated using criteria applied to all classes and criteria specific to online instruction.” Standard IIIA 1.b. They are asking us to use the same standards for online as for regular classes – they want to make sure that classes are equivalent. We can then refer to the contract.
   o Training: Suggested: “The institution (or District) provides adequate/sufficient/satisfactory training for online instructors” Standard III A.5., which requires districts to have something established to train faculty for online instruction. No structured training exists, but minimum qualifications do. ACCJC does require us to have training in addition to minimum qualifications. Documents may exist in HR for training, so it’s a big question whether this procedure should include the standards or just refer to existing standards. Perhaps we should include it here?
   o Qualifications: Separate from training - We should establish “readiness standards” as opposed to “min. quals”. Using “district” may exclude people
who received training elsewhere – the language should be broader than just our training. It’s an accreditation process. There is a Distance Ed as-hoc committee, but they’re missing people to do the work – there is a draft of the minimum qualifications for distance ed instruction. CRFO is looking at it, too. So we could refer to it as opposed to including it here. Since this is a hybrid of a BP and AP, we may have to include more in it. Mark suggested “Faculty Qualifications for Online Instruction – The district will establish and implement a method to identify instructors qualified to teach online.” Standard III A 1.a.

- Grievances: ACCJC requires us to have an online student grievances file. They need to see that we are addressing student concerns, and can provide documentation. The complaints would go to the Dean, the dean will document something, and keep it on file. It needs to be an online specific file, but not kept online. It is meant for student support and instructional feedback, but not for evaluations. Standard II B.2.
- Substantive Change: Is it appropriate to mention Substantive Change in this AP? ACCJC requires all colleges to have no more than 50% of their courses in a program to be online. Evidence that is acceptable – When the college plans to offer a degree or certificate where half or more is online a Substantive Change must be submitted to ACCJC prior to offering. There is also a Substantive Change manual available online. Aside from Mark’s suggested additions, he felt that our draft looked good and only needed work on language. “It looks good”.

The committee worked a little more on the beginning of the draft, after the earthquake.

3.2. Edit Existing ASPC Portion of Senate Bylaws: The committee made two changes: changing “Chief Academic Officer” to “CIO/CSSO” and editing out the last section (3. a-e). The revised ASPC section of the bylaws will be presented to the Senate on October 18.

3.3. AP 3900 Speech: Time Place & Manner: Chair Wolfsen asked committee members to read the AP and bring back any suggested edits/revisions at the next ASPC meeting on October 25.

4. Announcements/Open Forum: no announcements

5. Adjournment: On a motion by Ruth Moon, seconded by Sally Urban, the meeting was adjourned at 4:51 pm.
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