PROGRAM REVITALIZATION, SUSPENSION, AND/OR DISCONTINUATION

Philosophy and Purpose

The College of the Redwoods District is committed to the vitality and integrity of its educational programs as validated by processes of regular and ongoing evaluation. Following a transparent process and using appropriate data, this procedure provides a framework for the effective consideration of program vitality that utilizes regular and rigorous institutional evaluation, and in those instances where consideration of discontinuance is appropriate, provides a framework and a process of effective engagement within which to consider the relevant issues and to come to an appropriate and timely institutional resolution.

This procedure will be used to review the revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance of instructional programs. An instructional program is defined as a discipline and/or an organized sequence or grouping of courses leading to a defined objective such as a major (area of emphasis), degree, or certificate.

Changes in the following indicators may cause a program to be recommended to the President/Superintendent for evaluation (based on quantitative and qualitative data):

- Program review and analysis trends (i.e. enrollment, FTES/FTEF ratio, success and retention rates, etc.)
- Degree and certificate completions
- Alignment with the Chancellor’s Office priorities, the College’s mission, and accreditation standards
- Alignment with state and federal requirements
- Changes in requirements from transfer institutions
- Availability of fulltime and associate faculty
- Budget concerns and lack of sufficient funding
- Changes in demand in the workforce
- Lack of adequate facilities and equipment
- Outdated curriculum

The Program Review process, unit plans, and other strategic, educational and annual planning activities should be referenced and considered among sources of data and direction in this process, but it is important to emphasize that their primary purpose and use is not to target programs for discontinuance. It is also important to note that program revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance should occur only after serious deliberation.

It is necessary to keep in mind that during times of budget reductions or reallocations which necessitate the reduction in (cutting) class sections and reduction in faculty positions, it is possible that the College may not have sufficient course offerings to maintain a program or a
major at the College. In such instances, as best as possible, consideration should be given to satisfying the mission of the College and accreditation standards, meeting student needs, and addressing fiscal realities.

Consideration of Collective Bargaining Rights

Nothing contained in this Administrative Procedure is intended to infringe upon, diminish, or supersede any collective bargaining rights established for employees of the District. It is the intention of the District that consideration of issues that fall under the scope of bargaining be addressed through the regular processes established for such consideration by the District and its collective bargaining units.

Program Revitalization, Suspension and/or Discontinuance Evaluation Process

Step One: Program Analysis Request

Program revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance discussions can be initiated by the administration, faculty within the discipline, the Program Review Committee or the Academic Senate at any time by submitting a Program Analysis Request (Appendix A) to the President/Superintendent. Recommendations from individual departments or advisory committees will be brought to the appropriate division dean to bring forward to the Vice President. The Vice President will consult with the Academic Senate Co-Presidents on the recommendations moving forward.

Step Two: Appointment of the Task Force

If a Program Analysis Request is approved by the President/Superintendent, he or she will, with consultation with Expanded Cabinet, appoint a Task Force. The Task Force shall be composed of the following:

- 2 Deans or Directors not connected to the program of the program (Co-Chair, with one of the faculty members described below)
- Academic Senate Co-President or designee member of the Executive Committee.
- 1 faculty member who teaches in the program appointed by the Academic Senate (or designee appointed by the President if a faculty member is not available)
- 1 faculty member 2 faculty members who are not a member of the program or division appointed by the Academic Senate (or designee appointed by the President if a faculty member is not available)
- 1 representative appointed by the President/Superintendent
- 1 manager appointed by the Managers Council

Deans/Directors or faculty who are responsible for, or teach in, the program under review will not serve as members of the task force but will be expected to provide information to the task force.

To protect the revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance process, all task force members are required to maintain confidentiality throughout and after the conclusion of the process. Confidential information includes issues discussed during the process. All
information relating to the process may only be discussed with other task force members or administrators in the chain of command of the program under review.

The Task Force will be co-chaired by a faculty member to be selected from and by the membership of the Task Force. The responsibilities of the co-chairs of the Task Force include, but are not be limited to, the following:

- Consultation with the Office of Institutional Research and other resources to validate information being used in determining recommendations
- Maintenance of objectivity and integrity during the entire process
- Written summary recorded for each meeting
- Production of a Task Force Recommendation Report

Step Three: Program Analysis

The Office of Institutional Research will complete the Program Analysis Form (Appendix B) within two weeks of the President/Superintendent’s approval of the Program Analysis Request and submit this to the co-chairs of the Task Force, who will then begin work analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data provided.

Current and past quantitative and qualitative data on the program must be researched and reported so that the Task Force can make an informed recommendation to the President/Superintendent and Expanded Cabinet regarding the program’s revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance.

Program faculty will have the opportunity to provide information about their program prior to the initial recommendation by the task force(s). Deans/Directors or faculty who are responsible for, or teach in, the program under review will have the opportunity to review the initial recommendation for findings of fact.

Step Four: Task Force Program Recommendation Report

Subsequent to review of all of the relevant information, the Task Force, working with the Office of Institutional Research, will present its findings, including a recommendation on a course of action, and a timeframe for resolution to the Vice President and President/Superintendent. This recommendation report shall be submitted no more than 60 days after formation of the Task Force unless otherwise agreed to between the Vice President and the task force co-chairs.

The three possible recommendations that may be provided by the Task Force include:

1. Program Revitalization: A program may be recommended to continue with qualifications. These may include, but are not limited to, specific interventions designed to improve the viability and responsiveness of the program. Examples of Program Revitalization may include a plan of action to enhance the performance and effectiveness of an existing program, which could include training/professional development for faculty and/or curriculum changes/updates; a recommendation to restructure an existing program for
greater effectiveness; reallocation of resources; or a recommendation to develop a new
program from the existing program.

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Revitalization shall include a
timeline during which these interventions will occur, an assessment plan, and expected
outcomes. All interventions and timelines will also be communicated in writing to the
appropriate administrator. After the specified revitalization period is completed the
program will be reviewed again on a regular program review cycle.

2. Program Suspension: A program may be recommended for a one or more years
suspension. Any recommendation for program suspension must include the criteria used
to arrive at the recommendation. Examples or reasoning for the temporary suspension
may include but are not limited to:

- Safety issues
- Lack of required equipment or facilities
- Lack of available fulltime or associate faculty
- Regulatory suspension,
- Lack of funding resources
- Misalignment with state, Chancellor’s Office priorities, the College’s mission,
  accreditation standards, federal law/mandates
- Budget concerns and lack of sufficient funding

The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program Suspension shall include: a
detailed plan and recommended timeline for the suspension of the program with the least
impact on students, faculty, staff and the community; an impact report explaining how
phasing out the program for suspension will affect students, faculty, staff, and the
community based on the Program Analysis data; the amount of cost savings achieved by
virtue of the program’s suspension; recommendations for how currently enrolled students
may meet their educational objectives through alternative means while the program is
under suspension; and the requirements of collective bargaining for faculty and staff,
including application of policies for reduction in force and opportunities for retraining of
faculty and staff, if necessary, while the program is under suspension.

3. Program Discontinuance: A recommendation to discontinue a program will occur when,
after a full evaluation study, it is concluded that it is no longer in the best interest of the
College, its students, and the larger community for the program to continue. Any
recommendation for program discontinuance must include the criteria used to arrive at
the recommendation. The Task Force Recommendation Report for Program
Discontinuance shall include the following: a detailed plan and recommended timeline
for phasing out the program that minimizes the impact on students, faculty, staff and the
community; an impact report explaining how phasing out the program will affect
students, faculty, staff, and the community based on the Program Analysis data; the
amount of cost savings achieved by virtue of the program’s discontinuance;
recommendations for how currently enrolled students may meet their educational
objectives through alternative means; and the requirements of collective bargaining for
faculty and staff, including application of policies for reduction in force and opportunities
for retraining of faculty and staff.
The Task Force’s written report will consist of 1) a summary of the data, 2) an analysis of the data, 3) the recommendation, 4) the factors used to make the recommendation, and 5) a detailed assessment of the recommendations’ impact on the college’s overall educational program and budget, as well as its impact on students, faculty, and staff involved.

**Step Five: Decision**

The President/Superintendent has full responsibility and authority to implement the decision as designee of the Board of Trustees. If the President/Superintendent decides to implement the recommendation for revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance, the President/Superintendent will task the appropriate administrators to work with faculty and staff to develop the program revitalization, suspension or discontinuance timeline, taking into consideration the following:

- Faculty reassignment by FSA or termination
- Staff reassignment or termination
- Alternatives for students to complete program degrees and/or certificates
- Redistribution/discontinuance of equipment, supplies, facilities, and budget

If the President/Superintendent decides not to implement the recommendation for revitalization, suspension, or discontinuance, then he or she shall communicate the reasons in writing to the Expanded Cabinet. If the final decision is to suspend or discontinue the program, then the Chief Instructional Officer or the Chief Student Services Officer, Chief Human Resources Officer, Academic Senate, CRFO, CSEA, and appropriate deans/directors will participate in the following steps:

- Consult with affected faculty and staff member(s) regarding their employment rights
- Consult with students regarding their options for program completion or transfer
Academic Senate Meeting
February 21, 2014

AGENDA ITEM 4.1
Appendix A
PROGRAM ANALYSIS REQUEST FORM

Program Name:

This Program Analysis Request must be supported by the program review or other appropriate data and shall be submitted to the President/Superintendent. The President/Superintendent will determine if a Task Force shall be convened to evaluate the program for revitalization, suspension or discontinuance.

Please check the indicators that triggered the initiation of the program revitalization, suspension or discontinuance process. Please attach the program’s most recent Program Review to this proposal request.

MULTIPLE INDICATORS (please check multiple indicators below)

| ✓ | Multiple Indicators (please check the indicators below) |
|---------------------------------|
| Enrollment has declined at least three of the last five years. |
| FTES/FTEF is consistently below the district average, or has declined at least three of the last five years. |
| Success rates are consistently below the district average, or have declined at least three of the last five years. |
| Retention rates are consistently below the district average, or have declined at least three of the last five years. |
| Program completions are consistently below the division’s district average, or have declined at least three of the last five years. |
| Insufficient availability of courses for students to complete the program within its stated duration |
| Nonaligned with state, the Chancellor’s Office priorities or College mission |
| Nonaligned with federal and state law |
| Lack of available program personnel (faculty/staff) |
| Inadequate equipment and/or facilities |
| Changes in the local and/or regional job market |
| Changes in community/student needs or interests |
| Change in transfer requirements |
| Diminished outside funding resources |
| Program creates financial hardship for the institution |
| Budget concerns and lack of sufficient funding |
| Outdated curriculum |
| Other: |

Name of Requestor Date

Approved Denied
If the Program Analysis Request is approved by the President/Superintendent, the Director of Institutional Research will complete the Program Analysis Form within a two-week period and submit to the co-chairs of the Task Force. The form will address all applicable criteria below for the most recent 6 terms (compared to the current district average) unless information is unavailable or not applicable.

**PROGRAM REVITALIZATION, SUSPENSION AND/OR DISCONTINUANCE**

**PROGRAM ANALYSIS FORM– QUANTITATIVE DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Average (if applicable)</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sections offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fill rates/caps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FTES/FTEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Term-to term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persistence of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students in the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C or better)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduated/certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expense or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual cost/FTES trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Labor market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demand: vocational and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program/area transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENDA ITEM 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM ANALYSIS FORM – QUALITATIVE DATA**

This report will address all applicable criteria below unless information is unavailable or not applicable.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> The impact the action will have on the general education curriculum or the curriculum of other programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> The ability of students to complete their degree or certificate or to transfer. This includes maintaining the catalog rights of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> The College’s ability or inability to provide the resources to maintain the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Balance of college curriculum (for example, ensuring the non-elimination of all of one type of programs, such as foreign languages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Replication of programs in the surrounding area and their efficacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> The potential impact on diversity at the College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Alignment with Chancellors Office priorities, college mission, accreditation standards, and state and federal law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Effects on local business and industries- i.e., declining market/industry demand (local, regional).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Availability of the program at other community colleges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> If this is a grant-funded program, what was the agreed institutional commitment for the campus to continue this program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> List specific financial resources required to sustain the program:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty compensation FT/PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support Staff compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilities costs annualized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Equipment costs annualized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supplies cost annualized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Potential impact on the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Math Competency Graduation Requirement

CIS faculty, with the support of the Math faculty, propose instituting a math competency graduation requirement. A math competency graduation requirement is proposed for two purposes: 1) Insure students who graduate with a CR associate degree meet a required level of mathematics. 2) Allow other analytical-related courses in addition to math under area D3 (Language and Rationality: Analytical Thinking) of the “General Education Requirements for the Associate Degree.”

The math competency requirement can be satisfied two different ways: 1) Successfully complete a math course that meets the math competency requirement, or 2) pass a math competency exam.
EMERITUS TITLE AND STATUS

Emeritus status is an honorary designation conferred upon retirees to recognize their accomplishments and contributions to the Redwoods Community College District.

An emeritus title for retired personnel shall be awarded by Board action upon the recommendation of the President.

Former BOT BP 342 adopted March 4 1991 (number change only 8/12)
Amended December 2, 1996
Reviewed/revised by Academic Standards and Policies Committee February 2014
EMERITUS TITLE AND STATUS

Emeritus status is an honorary designation conferred upon retirees to recognize their accomplishments and contributions to the Redwoods Community College District.

An emeritus title for retired administrative personnel shall be awarded by Board action upon the recommendation of the President.

Members of the faculty shall be awarded an emeritus title by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of both the Academic Senate and the President.

Members of the classified staff shall be awarded an emeritus title by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of both the Classified Senate and the President.

Members of the classified management staff and the classified confidential staff shall be awarded an emeritus title by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President.

Former BOT BP 342 adopted March 4 1991 (number change only 8/12)
Amended December 2, 1996
Reviewed/revised by Academic Standards and Policies Committee November 2013
EMERITUS TITLE AND STATUS

Eligibility

The candidate must have performed at least ten years of full-time service to the District or the equivalent in part-time service.

Process

1) The employee seeking the emeritus title shall submit a written request to their Supervisor. An employee may also be nominated for emeritus status by a colleague from the District, with the consent of the nominated employee.
2) Each nomination for emeritus status shall include a brief narrative summary citing the professional accomplishments and record of District service.
3) The Supervisor will verify eligibility and forward the nomination(s) as follows:
   a. Faculty nominations are submitted to the Academic Senate for approval; once approved, the Academic Senate forwards the nominations to the President.
   b. Manager nominations are submitted to the Manager’s Council for approval; once approved, the Manager’s Council forwards the nominations to the President.
   c. Classified employee nominations are submitted to the Classified Executive Board for approval; once approved, the Classified Executive Board forwards the nominations to the President.
   d. Administrator and Confidential employee nominations are forwarded directly to the President.
4) The President will submit all employee nominations with the President’s recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Privileges

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

Former Administrative Regulation No. 342, number change only on August 7, 2012
Approved: December 2, 1996
Reviewed/revised by Academic Standards and Policies Committee February 201
PROCESS FOR DETERMINING EMERITUS STATUS

Classified Staff

Members of the classified staff who are retired or are about to retire may be nominated by their colleagues by means of a letter to the Classified Senate setting forth the reasons for the nomination and signed by at least ten members of the permanent, classified staff. Members of the classified management staff and the classified confidential staff shall be awarded an emeritus title by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President. The Classified Senate and the President shall use the following criteria in determining whether to recommend a candidate for emeritus status:

1. The candidate must have performed at least ten years of full-time service to the District or the equivalent in part-time service.

2. The candidate's service must be distinguished and exemplary as reflected in evaluations and in the opinion of colleagues from administration, faculty, and staff.

3. The candidate must have made a significant, positive contribution to the District, performing services well beyond the minimum required by the job.

A list of classified staff designated as "emeritus" will be maintained by the Classified Senate and the Human Resources Office. Emeritus staff will be listed in the catalog, will be regularly included in appropriate campus functions, and, upon their request, will be granted the following at no charge:

1. library cards,
2. staff parking permits,
3. athletic event passes, and
4. use of the pool and athletic facilities.

It is the intent of the District that emeritus classified staff be continuously recognized for the excellence of their service and their many contributions and that they be included to the greatest extent possible in the life of the College.

Former Administrative Regulation No. 342, number change only on August 7, 2012
Approved: December 2, 1996
Readiness Standards for Online Instructors

DRAFT

Faculty shall meet any of the following three criteria prior to teaching an online course for College of the Redwoods:

1. **Complete CR Online Teaching and Learning Training** sponsored by the DE Committee in consultation with the Academic Senate.
2. **Certificate of Completion in Online Teaching** from an accredited college or university, such as UCLA online Teaching Program, Cerro Coso Online Educators Certificate Program, or @One Teaching Certification Program.
3. **Demonstrate prior successful experience** in teaching online course(s) (e.g., Satisfactory faculty evaluation using the Supplemental Distance Education Evaluation Form (schedule F-2DE) or equivalent.)

**Relevant ACCJC guidelines (2012): Standard IIIA**

- Evidence the institution has a reasonable means for deciding what employee qualifications are needed for positions with teaching responsibility for DE/CE courses, and
- Evidence there are practices in place to determine that an applicant is well qualified to teach DE/CE Courses.

**Sources**

Mt San Jacinto College DE Faculty Handbook
[http://my.msjc.edu/web/ol/DE%20Faculty%20Handbook%20posted.pdf](http://my.msjc.edu/web/ol/DE%20Faculty%20Handbook%20posted.pdf)

Pasadena City College DE Faculty Handbook
[http://online.pasadena.edu/faculty/hb/facultyprep/](http://online.pasadena.edu/faculty/hb/facultyprep/)

College of the Canyons Online Instructor Qualifications

**Reviewers**

Academic Senate ad hoc DE Committee
Distance Education Committee
Excerpt from Academic Senate Constitution:

ARTICLE V
Senate Officers and Election of Officers

Section 1. The officers of the Senate are Co-presidents, elected annually by a majority of the members eligible to vote, excluding the Co-presidents and ex-officio, nonvoting members.

a. Senate Co-presidents are elected from among tenured Senators past or present only. Upon the election of a Co-president, a new Senator may be elected to represent the Co-president’s Division if the Co-President-elect vacates an active term as Senator.

b. The Senate Co-presidents annually name a Senate Co-presidents Nominations Committee. The Committee must announce Senate Co-president nominations no later than the second meeting in April each year.

Section 2. Co-presidents serve one-year terms (July 1 to June 30) and may seek reelection. Co-presidents serve no more than three (3) consecutive terms.

Section 3. Either Co-president may be removed by a majority of the members eligible to vote, excluding the Co-presidents and ex-officio, nonvoting members. Removal (recall) vote is initiated by a removal (recall) petition signed by no less than one fifth of the Senate membership. Upon removal, the Co-president is no longer a member of the Senate.

Section 4. A Co-president vacancy is filled by majority Senate vote at the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting following the effective date of the vacancy.

Section 5. A Co-president elected to fill a vacancy assumes her/his duties immediately upon election.

Section 6. Of the Co-presidents, only the presiding Co-president shall vote, and then only when the vote will change the outcome.
PART ONE: Three Options for Multicultural Understanding

*Excerpt from a letter by then Curriculum Chair Peter Blakemore to Committee which was presented to Academic Senate on April 19

1. Establish a specific A.A. / A.S. General Education requirement (e.g., a hypothetical “Area E: Multicultural Understanding”) using existing, appropriate courses or by creating new ones that would fulfill the requirement and that could double count towards other areas in the CSU transfer pattern and/or the IGETC transfer patterns where appropriate. This level of action would change the course outline of record for those courses alone and expand the GE requirements for Associates Degrees and for Transfers at CR.

2. Expand CR’s General Education outcomes to include meaningful language regarding multicultural and diversity learning. To be used in course, program, and institutional review and mapping.

3. Establish a diversity, equity, and/or multicultural section in the course outline of record where faculty can propose that a specific course qualifies as such. Combined with numbers 1 and 2 above, this would allow any faculty to propose that the course meets the requirement. On its own, this would potentially allow any course to be defined as meeting diversity-related transfer credit, depending on articulation.

PART TWO: Discussion at Senate April 19, 2013

* Excerpt from April 19, 2014 formal Senate Meeting Minutes regarding Agenda Discussion Item 5.1 “Multicultural Understanding:

****: Peter Blakemore’s attachment was a communication to the Curriculum Committee to consider the infusion of multicultural diversity issues into curriculum; the committee voted to forward recommendation #1 to the Academic Senate. This should be a discussion for the whole college, but has been put forward from the Multicultural and Diversity Committee through the Curriculum Committee to get the discussion opened. HSU uses something similar and it is an important and useful idea. Susan Nordlof suggested we clarify the scope of multicultural diversity for this purpose as it means different things to different people. Steve Brown voiced concern about implementing added units to graduate that would impact completion rates for some courses; CR is quite frankly behind the curve of other colleges in doing this in our degrees. The college needs to implement something that meets the needs of the most students. This may prompt a larger discussion about all of our graduation requirements and not just the diversity part. Chris Gaines had similar concerns from his area of CTE as they also already have several degrees with over 60 units and are worried about bottlenecks. Has there been an analysis as to how many degrees would be impacted with over 60 credits? Peter countered the concern about double-dipping/overlapping classes citing that it would do the opposite of adding to bottlenecks. He also agreed that a definition is important and that articulation to other colleges is important. What we want to do is align ourselves with other colleges and that we are behind a little. It’s become a global/cultural context. The college needs to ask what is meant by diversity and what do we want for our students then ask about articulation and enrollment. This is the time for the discussion, but it won’t be done in a week or two, perhaps try to get it something into the next 2014-15 catalog. Solomon DeCamp brought up that anything going over 60 units would impede student success, and with the BOG fee waiver problems, students won’t want to complete or
even start college. Do not add to the student burden. Peter replied that the direction from the State is minimizing units. In terms of making a proposal, Dave Bazard agreed that the definition is needed and there’s also a need to address training and evaluation and how it will be done effectively. Peter replied that with the way CR has already reviewed General Education requirements makes it more believable that CR will be able to handle this. Jennifer asked if courses would have to go back to curriculum and was told that it would have to “be rolled in through the course of time” and that we cannot identify courses without deliberation. Ms. Gardner also wondered if it was being considered what impact this would have on the small campuses and that she liked the idea but was concerned? Kady Dunleavy questioned why option #1 was chosen instead of #3; Peter explained that the committee conceived 2 & 3 as being subsumed in #1 and also that the MDC preferred #1. Steve Brown added that by creating a requirement immediately we may be putting the cart before the horse and we should develop our curriculum, create the new courses, and infuse the content into our existing curriculum until we have a cohort of courses that would meet whatever the requirement becomes. Peter felt it was more like a complicated timing mechanism. It may need a revision of our GE. Dr. Goswami pointed out that we need to ask “What is the outcome we want to accomplish?” Peter responded that discussions are very important, as seen in the years we’ve discussed General Education. We need to get the discussion RE-started. The Art Department made a commitment and has components of multicultural and diversity SLOs in their classes, and they do assessments, so the conversation has begun in Art. Cindy Hooper offered that an inventory of assessments vis-a-vis diversity would be helpful. Dave Bazard asked where this is going as far as the Senate is concerned; is there a task force to pull all of this together? We started this discussion seven years ago and it became sort of diluted, so what’s the next step? Copresident Richards responded that we are having the discussion, making notes of all the input today; we can put it all together and work with Curriculum - work collaboratively. It could result in an ad-hoc committee with Senate and Curriculum represented-he will recommend to next year’s Copresidents that it be a topic at the August retreat. It is a topic of major interest to all, and we need to continue the discussion.

*****

PART THREE: Next Step

*Excerpt from an Email from Philip Mancus re: current disposition of “Multicultural Understanding”:

From: Philip Mancus
Sent: Saturday, January 18, 2014 5:28 PM
To: Brown, Bob
Cc: Renner, Mark; Williams, Debbie
Subject: Follow up on Agenda Item 5.1 from AS agenda 4/19/13

Hi Bob and Mark,

...

At its last meeting the MDC discussed integrating equity and diversity related outcomes into course outlines. In that conversation, we were reminded by the Curr Com chair, George—who was attending in an advisory capacity, of the three options we recommended to the Curriculum Committee in Spring 2013:

1. Create a new diversity and common GE category similar to HSU,
2. Change the GE global awareness category to be more specifically diversity related, and
3. Require course outlines to address diversity.

These items were received and discussed by the Curriculum Committee last spring, which then voted to recommend number 1 (in revised form) to the full Senate. The item was discussed at the April 19 meeting of the Senate, but was not brought up for action at the next meeting, nor to my knowledge has it been on this year's agenda. Our question is: what happened to this item? Are there plans to proceed? Is there further discussion afoot?

…

Thanks,

Philip
Distance Education Substantive Change Taskforce  
Dan Calderwood, Jeff Cummings, Sydney Larson, MaryGrace McGovern, Mark Renner, Mark Winter

Virtual Campus Conceptual Framework and Recommendations

Student success is the highest priority for College of the Redwoods. This success is directly tied to access which is a significant challenge for CR due to its 10,000 square mile District. The college has found, in its commitment to provide access to all who can benefit from instruction and to meet the diverse and ever-changing educational, cultural, and economic requirements of the communities of Humboldt, Del Norte, and Mendocino counties, a need to provide educational opportunities directly to students' homes and workplaces. This can best be accomplished through distance education instructional delivery modalities.

As the college reviews the status of the existing courses and programs offered via Distance Education (DE), examines current practices, requirements, and expectations related to aligning DE with our mission and meeting ACCJC standards and policies for DE, we realized that College of the Redwoods has significant work to do in order to define and build the appropriate DE structure that will ensure the college develops and maintains an effective, sustainable, and student centered program.

The conceptual framework of a Virtual Campus represents an institutional commitment to addressing DE course and program delivery at a priority level that is equal to other instructional sites within the district. This comprehensive approach to DE delivery will ensure that there is a strong and continued focus on distance education for CR. This program will ensure that faculty using a distance education modality will be trained to deliver high quality instruction, faculty will meet qualifications through an approval process to be assigned DE sections, and the administration and faculty will appreciate the importance of accurately assessing the efficacy of DE instruction, student success and student achievement.

Development of the Virtual Campus will necessitate collaboration between the Office of Instruction and Student Development and faculty leadership. The Virtual Campus is intended to support CR’s delivery of DE courses and programs and not to override the authority and responsibility of our administrators to schedule courses, manage enrollment priorities based on an institutional commitment to centralization of scheduling, and the hiring and evaluation of qualified faculty.

The Virtual Campus requires intentional and well planned long term institutional support to be viable, effective, and sustainable. The District will need to make a strong and well thought out commitment to high quality DE course and program delivery in order to fully realize an effective and well-functioning Virtual Campus.
Progress has been made on developing the Virtual Campus by assigning DE oversight to a permanent administrative manager; the Director of the Learning Resources. This position co-chairs the DE Advisory Committee along with a faculty member. The DE Advisory Committee is made up of a cross representation of District employees; academic advisors, faculty who are assigned by the Academic Senate, the Director of Institutional Research, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, as well as representatives from technology departments and the student body. Their role is to inform the other functional planning groups, as well as administration and the Academic Senate, of the resources and actions that need to take place to meet accreditation standards, as well as approving activities that will support student success. District resources have been committed to the DE program by the approval to hire an Instructional Multi-Media-Developer to enhance course delivery and provide training resources to faculty and staff.

The following are recommendations prioritized by the taskforce:

1. **Describe and approve a structure for a Virtual Campus (Distance Education Program) including faculty, curriculum, and technology support staffing.** *(This Document)*

**NEXT STEPS:**
- Submit the Taskforce draft to the VP of Instruction and Student Development for review and approval
- Review at appropriate Senate Meeting
- Use this document as a foundation for the Substantive Change Proposal

2. **Establish a process to train faculty to meet internal readiness standards to teach online.**

**DRAFT**

**Readiness Standards for Online Instructors**

Faculty shall meet **any** of the following three criteria prior to teaching an online course for College of the Redwoods:

1. **Complete CR Online Teaching and Learning Training** sponsored by the DE Committee in consultation with the Academic Senate.
2. **Certificate of Completion in Online Teaching** from an accredited college or university, such as UCLA online Teaching Program, Cerro Coso Online Educators Certificate Program, or @One Teaching Certification Program.
3. **Demonstrate prior successful experience** in teaching online course(s) (e.g., Satisfactory faculty evaluation using the Supplemental Distance Education Evaluation Form (schedule F-2DE) or equivalent, experience with distance education instruction.)
Relevant ACCJC guidelines (2012): Standard IIIA

- Evidence the institution has a reasonable means for deciding what employee qualifications are needed for positions with teaching responsibility for DE/CE courses, and
- Evidence there are practices in place to determine that an applicant is well qualified to teach DE/CE Courses.

Reviewers

Academic Senate ad hoc DE Committee
Distance Education Committee

NEXT STEPS:
- Discussion at Academic Senate meeting Friday, February 21, 2014
- Senate Approval at March Meeting if appropriate (3/7/14)
- Add DE training to Professional Development Center responsibility

3. Establish a process to approve faculty assignment to online courses.

At the administrative level, establish a process that allows for an efficient and accurate method of assigning faculty to courses delivered via DE. This will need to be in conjunction with the DE delivery training that will be required for all faculty preparing to teach via DE.

NEXT STEPS:
- Review response to #2 above from Senate and incorporate in this recommendation
- Brief CRFO in anticipation of contract implications

4. Institutionalize district wide online course and program development priorities and strategize.

AND

Revise curriculum Course Proposal and Outline form and the Program Review template to better monitor program requests regarding DE delivery over 50%.

During the Fall of 2013 College of the Redwoods was committed to making sure that full compliance with all ACCJC Standards and Policies was a correct and accurate position for the college. In alignment with completely meeting the standards the college made the decision to not offer courses via DE that could possibly move any of our degrees or certificates beyond the 50% threshold and create a noncompliance condition for the college.
CR is now off all sanctions and in a position to submit a Substantive Change Proposal requesting approval to offer degrees and certificates with more than 50% of the courses delivered via DE.

This is a unique and important position for the college because we now have the opportunity to, as a college community, decide collectively and in a comprehensive manner, which courses and which degree / certificates we want and need to develop for DE delivery in order to meet the needs of our students.

- Ensure GE completion track is available online.
- Confirm board approval of all programs that will include online delivery.

NEXT STEPS:
- Identify current degrees and certificates that have over 50% DE delivery
- Determine internal approval process for degrees and certificates included in substantial change proposal.
- Program level request to offer degree or certificate via DE incorporates into Program Review template.
- Work with curriculum committee on DE course approval on Course Approval form
- Notify current programs with more than 50% DE as to requirement of submitting a request (form) to CC for approval to offer their program via DE.
- Mark will work with George on the form

5. Ensure CLOs of online and f2f courses are consistently assessed and assessment results are compared.

From Dave Bazard:

The assessment reporting tool includes a designation (pull down menu) to indicate if a course-level assessment is FTF, Virtual, Hybrid, or represents a combination of sections delivered in different modes. The faculty are expected to comment on the findings for the later case. In addition, one can go back to the courses and compare the data from reports that indicate virtual to ones that indicate FTF. In other words, IR could pull out that data.

If the DE committee would like to see a modification to better meet educational standards, then that is something the Assessment Committee could work on – modification of the forms or process. The area I’ve noticed, is that the pull-down menu designation does not appear in the online report that is posted. I’ll ask Angelina about that detail.

NEXT STEPS:
- Confirm Completed
- Ask Angelina for update on status
6. **Build a process to ensure student preparedness for online learning.**

   We currently have a voluntary online orientation that is available to students preparing for online courses.
   The Taskforce recommends:
   - Development and implementation of a mandatory (non-credit?) online orientation class.
   - Create and make accessible to students an informational / promotional video as an introduction to the exciting world of online learning.

   **NEXT STEPS:**
   - DE Committee meeting – add to agenda
   - Look at other intuitions for best practices of student preparedness

7. **Build a means for online students to have a readily available student complaint process.**

   This is a direct ACCJC requirement and needs to be added to our home page. The ACCJC expectation of “readily available” is making sure the information is no more than one click away for the home page. The system will need to track all online student complaints and resolution. Reference faculty handbook criteria for requirements.

   Taskforce suggestion-
   - Develop virtual ticketing system?

   **NEXT STEPS:**
   - DE Committee discussion and recommendation
   - Develop a process and plan for determining if out of state students are enrolling in our on-line courses.

8. **Initiate annual student and faculty survey of online teaching and learning.**

   In order to ensure constant quality improvement of our DE course and program delivery it is important that we collect, and analyze on a consistent basis, feedback from our students and faculty related to teaching and learning.

   **NEXT STEPS:**
   - Discuss with Angelina for development or incorporate into existing survey
   - Thread results into our current institutional assessment process to ensure constant quality improvement of DE? (IEC?)
9. **Establish policy for formal proctoring, and identify proctor sites.**

DRAFT

**Online Course Proctoring**

College of the Redwoods

Instructors of online classes are encouraged to have proctored exams, especially for high stakes exams, to improve student authenticity. Proctoring is performed by College of the Redwoods personnel in the Learning Activities Center of the Learning Resource Center for all enrolled students within a thirty-mile radius of the Eureka, Crescent City, and Fort Bragg campus sites.

Students distant from a CR testing site may use a proctor not affiliated with the College who meets any of the following criteria: librarian, testing coordinator, administrator, or teacher at an elementary school or secondary school, community college, or university. In addition, military chaplains, testing administrators, or education services officers are acceptable.

It is the student’s responsibility to make arrangements both with the proctor using the CR “Student/Proctor Agreement Form.”

Provided by Mark Winter

**NEXT STEPS:**
- Approval from DE Committee
- Incorporate option into course approval form
  - Note on the course comments on schedule
  - Note campus meeting required
- Confirm policy or procedure approval needed (AP)
- Enhanced Student Authentication verified? May need to be included here

10. **Institutionalize updating and assessment of annual DE plan.**

The DE Advisory Committee will be responsible for developing, executing, and assessing the annual DE plan.

**NEXT STEPS:**
- Update plan prior to May 2014
- On agenda of DE Committee
- Recommend inclusion in annual planning cycle (IEC)
11. **Establish training for faculty and administrators to effectively evaluate online instruction.**

The evaluation of faculty teaching via DE must be as consistent, objective, effective, and well-structured as the evaluation of any other faculty teaching assignment.

To ensure an effective evaluation process for faculty teaching via DE it is important that those doing the evaluation are familiar with the expectations of an online teaching environment and trained to recognize and evaluate the quality of the DE instruction. Both faculty and administrators who will be evaluating faculty teaching via DE will need to be trained to ensure the high quality and rigor that is expected of our online instructors.

Taskforce Recommendation:
Incorporate Professional Development Center scope of responsibilities. Each faculty evaluation committee has a member with training

**NEXT STEPS:**
- Brief CRFO on possible contract implications
- Develop Workshop on evaluation of DE courses.
- Develop tracking and monitoring process to ensure consistent training.
DISTANCE EDUCATION

“Distance education is defined…as a formal interaction which uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and which supports regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously” (ACCJC, 2013).

Course Quality Standards
The same standards of course quality shall be applied to distance education as are applied to traditional classroom courses. Refer to the Curriculum Handbook.

Separate Course Approval
Each proposed or existing course offered by distance education shall be reviewed and approved separately. Separate approval is mandatory if any portion of the instruction in a course or a course section is designed to be provided through distance education.

The review and approval of new and existing distance education courses shall follow the curriculum approval procedures outlined in Administrative Procedure 4020 Program and Curriculum Development and the Curriculum Handbook.

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

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

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

Privacy
AGENDA ITEM 6.2

The District shall provide to each student at the time of registration a statement of the process in place to protect student privacy and estimated additional student charges associated with verification of student identity, if any.
Student Attendance Dates
Enrollment Services shall ensure compliance with Federal Regulations (34 CFR 668.22) pursuant to Return to Title IV Funds (R2T4) and VA-ONCE Notice of Change (38 CFR 21.4203) using faculty verification of last actual date of attendance as evidenced by active participation and reflected in the assessment of regular effective contact to calculate student’s earned and unearned portion of Title IV Aid.

Instructors are responsible for verifying student attendance dates in all sections in which:
- earned and unearned portions of Federal Student Aid (Title IV) are determined based upon the amount of time the student spent in attendance, and/or
- last actual date of attendance is used to determine status changes for students receiving Veteran (VA-ONCE) funds.

ADA Compliance
All distance education is subject to the requirements of Title 5 as well as the requirements imposed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S. Code Sections 12100 et seq.) and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S. Code Section 794d). Also, see Administrative Procedure 3412 Access to Programs and Facilities.

Evaluation of Instructors
Instructors teaching online classes shall be systematically evaluated using criteria applied to all classes, in addition to criteria specific to online instruction.

Instructor Preparation and Professional Development
The district shall establish readiness standards and implement a method to identify instructors qualified to teach online. The district shall provide ongoing training and professional development in support of distance education.

Student Grievances
The CIO or designee will maintain a file of all student grievances related to distance education and their resolutions.

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