I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA  
(1 min.)
Items 5, 6 and 3 moved to 2, 3, and 4 on the agenda to accommodate individuals attending to speak or receive feedback on these times.
Consensus Reached.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (February 22, 2013)  
(2 min.)
Consensus Reached.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: All public comments will be limited to three minutes in length for each speaker. Opportunities for public comment will also be provided for each agenda item during discussion on each item and before proposals are called for approval.
No Public Comment.

IV. BUSINESS AGENDA: Be sure to discuss these items with your division faculty so you can adequately represent your division in reaching consensus on these items.

1. New District Mission Statement  
(20 min.)

Background: During the Fall 2012 semester a workshop was held to discuss the District’s Mission statement, gather input and begin the process of reviewing and revising the District’s Mission statement. Following this workshop an ad hoc group was formed chaired by John Cascamo and included the following members; Greg Baxley, Karen Reyes, Kat Cater, Bill Demarest, Roland Finger and Pamela Ralston. After reviewing information from the Fall 2012 workshop, accreditation standards, and several other community college mission statements, this group prepared a draft new District’s Mission statement. This draft new District’s Mission statement was presented to College Council on February 26 and determined ready to be sent out for district-wide input. Appendix A is the draft new District’s Mission statement. The ad hoc group will consider all district-wide input,
make appropriate changes, and send a final draft to the Academic Senate by March 22 who will make a recommendation to College Council regarding a new District’s Mission statement. College Council will then forward a recommendation to the Superintendent/President who will take to the Board of Trustees for approval. Attached to the e-mail with this agenda are the notes from the Fall 2012 mission workshop and examples mission statements from other colleges for your review.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council will provide feedback on the proposed new District’s Mission statement as presented in Appendix A.

Consensus reached. Senate Council feedback was provided directly to Greg Baxley. Additionally, it was noted that ACCJC requires that the mission statement address the specific prompts regarding Distance Education from its “Guide to Evaluating Distance Education.”

DE Evaluation Guide
Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

A. Mission
The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

- How does the institution’s commitment to DE/CE align with its mission?
- Has the institution considered in consultation with its key constituents if and how DE/CE is congruent with the mission?
- Does the mission include any statements related to its commitment to DE/CE?
- Who are the intended students for the courses offered in DE/CE format; are they similar to or different from students studying in traditional learning mode?
- How does the institution determine its intended student population for courses offered in DE/CE mode?

2. Long-Term Budget Reduction Plan – Phase II (Academic Clusters Restructuring) (15 min.)

Background: As you are aware the Vice President of Academic Affairs has proposed restructuring academic clusters to identify $150,000 in savings as part of Phase II of the Long-Term Budget Reduction Plan. The proposed plan of how to restructure academic clusters that went to College Council as an information item on February 12, was e-mailed to Senators on February 8. Part of the savings that would be achieved by implementing this restructuring would be the elimination of two division chairs (Business and Human Development) and the reorganization of academic disciplines across the three clusters. Since the reorganization of academic disciplines clearly impacts academic and professional areas which faculty, by law, regulation, and board policy have responsibility and authority over (i.e. curriculum; educational program development; degree and certificate requirements; district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles; and processes for institutional planning and budget development), it would be appropriate, in honoring law, regulation, and board policy, that any restructuring of academic disciplines within clusters be made utilizing parameters and criteria established jointly by the Academic Senate and administration to ensure such restructuring reflects integrated planning processes, is done in context of how best to serve the
college mission, and further strengthens the intellectual, academic, and professional activities of the institution.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council requests, that because of the impact the restructuring of academic clusters has on several academic and professional areas which faculty, by law, regulation, and board policy have responsibility and authority over (i.e. curriculum; educational program development; degree and certificate requirements; district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles; and processes for institutional planning and budget development), that any restructuring of academic clusters be made utilizing parameters and criteria pursuant to a process to be established jointly by the Academic Senate and administration, and that any proposed restructuring of academic clusters be agreed upon by the Academic Senate Council before being implemented.

Consensus reached on the modified proposal.

3. Distance Education – Standards versus Best Practices (20 min.)

Background: In reviewing and discussing the Distance Education Pedagogical and Technological Readiness recommendations from the Distance Education Committee at two different Academic Senate Council meetings (November 2, 2012 and February 22, 2013) the Academic Senate Council has been unable to reach consensus, largely due to a philosophical difference between whether there should be standards and guidelines that all faculty who teach Distance Education (DE) would be required to meet prior to teaching in the DE modality, or best practices and recommendations that DE faculty would be expected to know and practice when teaching in the DE modality. In order for the work of the DE Committee to be approved, so the district can adequately prepare an application for substantive change with our accreditation commission, lift the moratorium on the approval of new DE courses, and meet all ACCJC accreditation standards and federal regulations regarding DE for the college’s 2014 Comprehensive Self-Evaluation and visit, the Academic Senate needs to reconcile this philosophical difference and take a position on one side or the other. The expectations by ACCJC and the federal government are higher for DE and are being looked at more closely. ACCJC and WASC are now enforcing DE requirements in their standards including elements that address effective communication, correspondence differentiation, student authentication, and 508 (accessibility) compliance for all DE courses. As an essential part of our commitment to student success in all areas of learning, DE courses at Cuesta should provide high quality, innovative instruction that maintains the highest standards and best practices in the teaching and learning environment delivered electronically. Therefore, in order for the district to demonstrate this commitment the faculty will need to decide whether there should be standards and guidelines that all faculty who teach DE would be required to meet prior to teaching in the DE modality or best practices and recommendations that DE faculty would be expected to know and practice when teaching in the DE modality. Coming to a decision with this will help inform and guide the work that needs to be done in this area. For your information, attached to the e-mail with this agenda is a document with excerpts from ACCJC’s Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education that might inform your thinking about this item. You should also be aware that CCFT is working on revising the DE evaluation instruments to embed best practices and recommendations that faculty who teach in this modality would be evaluated against. Lastly, it should be noted that if the Academic Senate Council decides to have standards and guidelines that all faculty who teach DE would be required to meet prior to teaching in the DE modality, that this would need to be negotiated for by CCFT.
Proposal: The Academic Senate Council supports the establishment of Distance Education Pedagogical and Technological Readiness best practices and recommendations that all faculty who teach Distance Education (DE) would be expected to know and practice when teaching in the DE modality.

Consensus reached. A presentation was given by Carina Love (see appendix C) to clarify issues associated with distance education.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council supports the establishment of Distance Education Pedagogical and Technological Readiness standards and guidelines that all faculty who teach Distance Education (DE) would be required to meet prior to teaching in the DE modality.

Proposal withdrawn.

4. MOOCs Resolution (15 min.)

Background: As you may be aware, one recent phenomenon in Distance Education is Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). At their title suggest, MOOCs are basically large scale online courses that may contain hundreds of students. In most instances, MOOC lectures are “canned,” quizzes and testing “automated”, student participation is “voluntary”, and students get “little” to no help from faculty. The MOOCs instructional paradigm works best for a small portion of self-directed learners, as evident from the fact that only 5% of students complete courses and a much smaller subset pass. MOOCs started as experiments at universities like Stanford, Harvard, and MIT, but are now being considered by many different institutions of higher education across the country. As of now, students cannot receive academic credit for MOOCs, but some universities are beginning to explore this this option. Although there is currently no discussion or interest locally in MOOCs, (at least as far I’m aware) it would be good for the Academic Senate Council to get ahead of this issue and take a position for when interest locally in these types of courses does happen. Appendix B is a draft of a possible resolution on MOOCs for the Academic Senate Council to consider.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves will provide feedback on the resolution Opposed the Offering of any Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) until Adequate Investigation and Determination of their Appropriateness by Faculty has Occurred as presented in Appendix B with feedback provided at the February 22, 2012 meeting.

Consensus Reached on the modified proposal. Feedback was incorporated into Appendix B.

5. SLO Assessment Cycle Calendars (15 min.)

Background: The Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP) endorsed by the Academic Senate Council in May 2010 included sample assessment cycle calendars that were designed to aid instructional programs in implementing SLO assessments to the level of ACCJC proficiency by Fall 2012 (a two-year cycle). This suggested timeframe was necessary in 2010, and was compressed even further by many programs in 2011 and 2012. Now that 100% of courses, degrees, and certificates have reached the proficient level of SLO implementation, assessment cycles can be relaxed to some extent. The SLOA co-coordinators and the SLOA committee recommend that assessment cycles be developed that align with program review cycles such that outcomes are assessed at least once in each four or five year program review cycle. Further details and sample calendars are available at http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/assessment_cycles_2013 (site will be available 3/8/2013).
Proposal: The Academic Senate Council requests that each degree and/or certificate program submit an assessment cycle calendar based on the program’s review cycle to the SLOA co-coordinators by May 15, 2013 following the submission details posted on the SLOA website.

Consensus reached on the modified proposal.

6. SLO Direct Assessment (15 min.)

Background: ACCJC has in their rubric for evaluating institutional effectiveness the term “authentic assessment” and this term is often interpreted as meaning direct assessment. Direct assessment methods include the evaluation of exams, portfolios, projects, performances, written work such as essays or papers, and presentations. For example, a multiple choice test with questions related to laboratory performance may be less “authentic” than evaluating performance in the lab directly. The college has a number of programs that are relying solely on indirect assessment methods such as student surveys. The SLOA co-coordinators continue to assert the value of indirect assessment methods. However, the commission and visiting teams seem increasingly focused on gathering evidence of direct assessments, and US Department of Education regulations also indicate that assessments of student learning be done using direct methods. In light of this trend, adding a direct method of assessment to complement existing indirect methods will provide the college with the evidence it needs meet existing or reasonably foreseeable standards regarding the types of assessments used by colleges. A simple one-page form will be provided by 3/8/2013 on the SLOA website for faculty use.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council requests that each degree and/or certificate program submit an assessment plan summary sheet that either summarizes how a direct method of assessment for Student Learning Outcomes has been used in the past or provide a plan for a direct assessment measure in their assessment plans prior to the next program review, to SLOA co-coordinators by May 15, 2013 following the submission details posted on the SLOA website.

Consensus reached.

7. Introduction to the Academic Senate SharePoint site for Council Members (15 min.)

Background: At the November 28, 2012 meeting, the Academic Senate Council approved the use of a SharePoint site as a document management and communications tool and appointed the Academic Senate Vice-President as the site administrator. The Academic Senate leadership is now ready to conduct a training to orient the council to the site and to use the site to make information available for future meetings. The training consists of the following (see attachment included in the e-mail with this agenda):

- site access, both through the campus network, and remotely
- basic site navigation
- site permission settings
- accessing information and documents via “lists and Libraries”

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the Academic Senate SharePoint site design with feedback provided at the March 8, 2013 meeting.
Tabled due to lack of time.

8. Adoption of an “All Faculty” Communication Tool & Retirement of myCuesta Academic Senate Groups (15 min.)

**Background:** Currently the Academic Senate maintains two myCuesta groups; the Academic Senate Group and the Academic Senate Council Group. These groups are no longer necessary with the adoption of an Academic Senate SharePoint site. The SharePoint site allows for two possible methods by which a faculty member can effectively communicate with all faculty as a group:

**Option 1.** The Academic Senate Leadership can manage an Outlook Exchange email list “allfaculty@cuesta.edu” which would be made available to the campus community and also linked from the Academic Senate SharePoint site in a manner similar to the “academicsenatecouncil@cuesta.edu” email list. Within the Academic Senate SharePoint site the list will be sent via the “Bcc” field. However this would not automatically be the case if the list is accessed through Outlook. The user would have to select “Bcc” to effectively block unnecessary use of the “reply all” feature.

**Option 2.** The Academic Senate Leadership can add a SharePoint “Announcements” web part to the Academic Senate SharePoint site and link it to an “all faculty” email alert. This option must be accessed via the Academic Senate SharePoint site – similar to the use of emailing via myCuesta.

**Proposal:** The Academic Senate Council approves retiring the myCuesta Academic Senate groups and approves Option 1 as stated in the background for this item above.

**Proposal withdrawn**

**Proposal:** The Academic Senate Council approves retiring the myCuesta Academic Senate groups and approves Option 2 as stated in the background for this item above.

**Consensus reached**

9. On-line Faculty Handbook (15 min.)

**Background:** At its November 2, 2012 meeting the Academic Senate Council designated the SharePoint wiki tool for the development of an electronic faculty handbook. The change to an on-line handbook was approved at the August 26, 2011 Academic Senate Council meeting. The Academic Senate By-Laws (revised Fall 2012) state that the Academic Senate Vice-President “shall maintain, or in consultation with the President, delegate the maintenance of all electronic communication and information sharing resources approved by the Academic Senate Council for use by the Academic Senate.”

The current Academic Senate Vice President (Julie Hoffman) has developed the structure and table of contents for the Handbook within the Academic Senate SharePoint site. The faculty handbook is currently accessible only to Academic Senate Council members. Feedback and approval of the table of contents (see attachment included in the e-mail with this agenda) is being requested, along with the appointment of additional content coordinators from within the Academic Senate Council for each subsection of Parts 2 and 3 of the Faculty Handbook. Julie Hoffman, the current Academic Senate Vice President volunteers herself as the content coordinator for all sub-sections of Part 1.
The duty of the coordinators will be to find content contributors for topics within their subsection of the Faculty Handbook. The content coordinators and contributors may choose to edit their sections directly in SharePoint or they may forward content in Word document format to the Academic Senate Vice-President (Julie Hoffman) for inclusion.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the table of contents for the On-Line Faculty Handbook with feedback provided at the March 8, 2013 meeting.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council approves the appointment of content coordinators from among Senate Council members and requests that content coordinators make every effort to have content for their section(s) forwarded to the Faculty Handbook editor two weeks prior to the last Academic Senate Council meeting of the Spring 2013 semester (Friday April 26).

Tabled due to lack of time.

10. Sabbatical Leaves

Background: There has been inconsistency among subsequent Sabbatical Leave Committees regarding whether or not it is appropriate for a sabbatical to be awarded to an applicant who proposes to split the sabbatical in a manner different from those outlined in BP 3251 – Sabbatical Leaves (http://academic.cuesta.org/president/2008BP/BP3000/3251.pdf) and as indicated on the Sabbatical Leave Application (attached to the e-mail with this agenda).

To summarize these documents allow for three possibilities:

1) Single Semester Leave:
2) Full Academic Year Leave:
3) Split Leave (must be completed within a two-year period)

In particular, splitting a one semester leave over more than one semester so as to allow the recipient to continue to teach or perform other work related duties seems to violate the spirit of a Sabbatical leave and reduces it to release time.

It has also come into question whether the sabbatical committee can conditionally award a sabbatical pending requested changes to a candidate’s proposal. The description of the Sabbatical Leave Committee that is included in the Senate By-Laws (http://academic.cuesta.edu/acasen/Seante_Bylaws_final_11_16_2012.pdf) and BP 3251 is not clear on this point.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council affirms that a Sabbatical Leave may be split only in one of the three ways explicitly stated in BP 3251 and directs the Academic Senate Leadership to review and revise BP 3251 – Sabbatical Leaves and the Sabbatical Leave Application accordingly and bring back to the Academic Senate Council for feedback and approval at a future meeting.

Tabled due to lack of time.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council affirms that the Sabbatical Leave Committee has the authority to conditionally award a sabbatical leave pending changes requested by the committee and
directs the Academic Senate Leadership to review and revise the Sabbatical Leave Committee Description listed in the Senate Bylaws to be consistent with any revisions made to BP 3251 and bring back to the Academic Senate Council for feedback and approval at a future meeting.

Tabled due to lack of time.

11. Academic Senate Cluster Priorities (15 min.)

Background: As discussed at the February 8th Academic Senate Council meeting, Senators were to discuss the cluster priorities for the Academic Senate with their divisional faculty. The cluster priorities for the Academic Senate are due March 29 and will be presented to Planning and Budget on April 16. Appendix B lists the 2012-2013 cluster priorities for the Academic Senate that were discussed at the February 8th Academic Senate Council meeting. Any feedback and/or suggestions of additional items that you or your divisional faculty feel should be prioritized or items that you feel should no longer be prioritize what should be the priorities for the Academic Senate for 2013-2014 are welcomed. The priorities for the Academic Senate are scored by Planning and Budget, along with all the other cluster priorities to develop a ranked funding prioritization list that is then used to fund items from when money is available.

Proposal: The Academic Senate Council will provide feedback on its 2013-2014 cluster priorities. Tabled due to lack of time.

V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: These are future and potential future agenda items (they are not in any order of importance). You do not need to discuss these items with your division faculty at this point. If there is an item that you are interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

- New Faculty Orientation

  Summary: On May 11, 2012 the Academic Senate Council approved the proposal; “The Academic Senate Council requests that the Faculty Professional Development Committee survey recently hired faculty to find out what was useful, what wasn’t and what they wish the new faculty orientation contained, and report these findings back to the Academic Senate Council at a future meeting.”

  Action: None at this point. This will come back as a future agenda item.

- Update of BP/AP 7150 – Administrator Evaluation

  Summary: On May 11, 2012 the Academic Senate Council provided the following feedback on the proposed revisions from Cabinet and the proposed new changes to Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 7150 for administrator evaluations.

  - This policy raises a conceptual question that should be brought back to all faculty for consideration before any policy is adopted: “What role should faculty play in evaluating administrators?”
  - Faculty need to be more educated about the process.
  - Faculty evaluations could be summarized or filtered to omit inappropriate or unprofessional comments.
  - The process of gathering faculty feedback needs to be conducted in a way that guarantees each faculty member can submit only one evaluation.
Action: None at this point. This will come back as a future agenda item.

- **Role and Responsibilities of Faculty and Administrators with Accreditation, Governance, and Planning**

  **Summary:** There continue to be confusion about the role and responsibilities of different individuals related to accreditation, governance and planning at Cuesta. We are going to have to continue dialoging and documenting what we as faculty see as our role in these areas and what we expect of our administrators, so that in the future, roles, responsibilities, and expectations are clear.

  **Action:** None at this point. This is a potential future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

- **Employee Workplace Bullying**

  **Summary:** Concerns have been raised about incidents of bullying among employees that have occurred, and in some cases are continuing to occur at Cuesta. The Academic Senate leadership has been asked to consider developing a resolution regarding bullying or workplace harassment among employees and to ultimately develop a policy that addresses workplace bullying.

  **Action:** None at this point. This will be a future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

- **Activities on FLEX Days**

  **Summary:** The recent request to hold a Strategic Planning retreat on Friday, October 7 (a FLEX day) has lead to controversy about the types of activities that should be scheduled on FLEX days.

  **Action:** None at this point. This will be a future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

- **F Grade for Students**

  **Summary:** At some point we may want to address the issue of the F grade for students who simply disappear or fail to show up. We currently calculate student success and retention based on faulty data because we don’t have a way of distinguishing between students who do not pass the class and those who simply fail to show up. In the past, this issue was discussed between the Senate Council and the administration. The possibility of a W/F grade was proposed. This still remains an important issue.

  **Action:** None at this point. This is a potential future agenda item. If anyone is interested in taking a lead on it, let Kevin or Julie know.

V. **INFORMATION ITEMS:** *Please share these items with your division faculty.*

1. **Conference Shared Learning Form** — *Reminder, faculty are not required to complete this Conference Shared Learning Form. I’ve asked the Faculty Professional Development committee to look at this form and decide whether they think it would be useful for faculty to*
utilize. If they think it might be useful (or some version of it) a proposal will come through the 
Academic Senate Council for approval.

2. Task Forces / Work Groups – Strategic Plan’s Institutional Objectives – Reminder, faculty 
are not required to serve on task forces and/or work groups to perform various work 
associated with our Strategic Plan’s Institutional Objectives.

3. Strategic Planning, Web, and Planning and Budget Committees – There are open faculty 
spots on the Strategic Planning, Web, and the Planning and Budget Committees. If you are 
interested in serving on one of these committees or know someone who might be, please let 
Kevin Bontenbal know. The Strategic Planning Committee meets the second and fourth 
Mondays of the month from 2:00 – 3:30 pm, the Web Committee meets the 3rd Wednesday of 
the month from 3:30 – 5:00 pm, and Planning and Budget meets the first and third Tuesdays of 
the month from 3:00 – 4:30 pm.

VI. Summit Agenda/Minutes – The agenda for the March 5 Summit meeting is attached to the e-mail 
with this agenda.

VII. SUMMIT ITEMS
Are there any items, campus issues, and/or divisional concerns/issues that anyone has that he/she feels 
need to be taken to “Summit” for answers/clarification?

The following issues were requested for follow-up at Summit:

1) DSPS testing (submitted by Patrick Len) - Main concerns of Physical Sciences Division regarding 
changes to DSPS testing policies:
   - Not getting top sheet (with log of student start and end times) back with exam?
   - Are students still continuously supervised for entirety of exams?

2) In light of the non-consultative approach by the administration regarding both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of 
the Budget Reduction Plan, the Council would like the Senate Leadership to discuss with administration 
a mechanism for consultation that also involves the Union for areas of joint responsibility to discuss 
potential problems before action is taken by the administration. (This came out of the discussion about 
item 2 proposal).

VIII. STANDING REPORTS (Time permitting – max. 3 min. per report)

1. CCFT—Merzon
2. Curriculum—Moore
3. College Council—Bontenbal
4. Planning & Budget—Hoffman/Bontenbal
5. Summit—Bontenbal/Hoffman
6. FSA Committee—Bontenbal
7. Basic Skills Initiative—Miller
8. SLOA Committee—Baxley/Demarest
9. Equivalency Committee—Scovil
10. Faculty Manual Task Force—Hoffman
11. FPDC—Silverberg
12. Book of the Year—Love
13. IPPR—Harris
14. Sabbatical Leave—McConnico

Next Meeting: Friday, March 22, 2013 | 2:30 pm | Room 3219 (Library)
APPENDIX A

San Luis Obispo County Community College District
PROPOSED NEW MISSION STATEMENT

An inclusive institution,¹ Cuesta College inspires students to achieve diverse educational goals. We effectively support students in their efforts to improve foundational skills, transfer to a four-year institution, earn a certificate or an associate degree, and advance in the workforce.²

Through exceptional and challenging learning opportunities, Cuesta College improves lives by promoting cultural, intellectual, and professional growth.³ We educate students to contribute to their communities, our nation, and the world.⁴

¹ Addresses ACCJC Standard I.A, “defining intended student population,” and embraces diversity by welcoming all students.
² Meets CCC primary missions as defined by CCCCO. These categories are required by the CCCCO. Meets Title V criteria under California Ed Code Section 66010.4. In addition, this sentence “defines the institution’s broad educational purposes” as required by ACCJC Standard I.A.
³ Are the broadest representation of Cuesta’s Institutional Learning Outcomes.(ILOs) This motivates those who are connected to the College, as discussed in the Mission Statement Workshop on 11-26-12. This statement reflects our commitment to achieving student learning as required by Standard I.A.
⁴ This mission statement was intended to accomplish the following items outlined by the Mission Statement Workshop on 11-26-12: inspires support and commitment to the student population, is convincing and easy to grasp, describes what we do with active verbs, and is memorable enough to recall or repeat.
APPENDIX B

Opposed the Offering of any Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) until Adequate Investigation and Determination of their Appropriateness by Faculty has Occurred

Whereas, Serious academic and proprietary concerns have been raised regarding Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), and appropriate caution has been expressed by the president of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges;

Whereas, MOOC lectures are “canned,” quizzes and testing “automated”, and students participation is “voluntary”, and students get “little” to no help from faculty; characterized by automated testing, voluntary student participation, and little student to faculty interaction;

Whereas, The MOOCs instructional paradigm appears to work best for a small portion of self-directed learners, as evident from the fact that only 5% of students complete courses and a much smaller subset pass;

Whereas, Implementation of MOOCs without consultation from the faculty presents may present a threat to shared governance and academic freedom;

Whereas, Copyright clearance and intellectual property can be costly and institutions bear these responsibilities for clearing copyright and copyright violations when they partner with commercial MOOC providers. There exists the potential for costly litigation regarding copyright issues when partnering with MOOC providers; and

Whereas, MOOCs represent “teacher less classrooms” often utilize unsupervised learning environments that could undermine academic integrity and rigor;

Resolved, That the Cuesta College Academic Senate and Cuesta College Federation of Teachers oppose the offering of MOOCs until such time that the faculty have adequately investigated and determined the appropriateness of this new form of instruction at the San Luis Obispo County Community College District (SLOCCCD); and

Resolved, That if MOOCs are found to be appropriate, that the first offering of a MOOC by the SLOCCCD be done as a pilot to further test and investigate the appropriateness of MOOCs through an evaluation based on formative and summative criteria, and if appropriate, include qualitative and quantitative measurements and assessments.
Today’s Objectives

- Review Distance Education Status
- Cuesta’s Response So Far
- Future Recommendations

Why are we here?

- Nationally in response to increases in online delivery, student debt, and poor outcomes, federal, state, and accreditation groups have stepped up regulation of online courses
- USDE is pushing ACCJC and WASC to enforce DE requirements more closely to ensure program integrity
  - Regular effective and substantive communication
  - Correspondence differentiation
  - Student authentication
  - 508 compliance

USDE Audits

- USDE also might audit
- USDE audits can include examination of syllabi, student and faculty interviews, and usage patterns on the Learning Management System by faculty and students.
- Courses which largely consist of written work completed and submitted by students and graded by instructors, and/or completion of tests, will fit the definition of correspondence education rather than distance education.
- St. Mary’s of the Woods Audit: USDE determined that SMW was delivering correspondence courses. Asked to return $42 million in Student Aid monies
How should Cuesta respond?

- Distance Education Committee Recommends
- Define Distance Education at Cuesta
- Pick a Pedagogically Accepted Rubric
- Create Best Practices based on Rubric
- Train Instructors, Evaluators, Administration (@One and DE Trainers)
- Create processes and procedures based on rubric
- Create DE Peer Evaluation process that is mapped to campus rubric that mirrors face-to-face (CCFT Task Force)

### DE Definition

**Distance Education (DE)**

- Instruction delivered to students who are separated from the instructor
- Regular and substantive interaction between students and the instructor
- May use Internet, one- or two-way transmissions, audio/video conferencing, DVDs or CD-ROMs

34 C.F.R. § 602.3 (Definitions).

### Chico Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Learning Support and Resources | - Use by many campuses
| 2. Online Log Design and Delivery | - Comprehensive
| 3. Instructional Design and Delivery | - Simple
| 4. Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning | - Maps well to Cuesta’s Services
| 5. Assessment and Feedback | |

Why Chico?

- Used by many campuses
- Comprehensive
- Simple
- Maps well to Cuesta’s Services

### Correspondence Course Defined

- Instructional material provided by mail or electronic transmission (including examinations) to students who are separated from the instructor
- Limited interaction between student and instructor and primarily initiated by students
- A course that is typically self-paced

34 C.F.R. § 602.3 (DOE Definitions)
Regular, Effective and Substantive Communication (ACCJC Req.)

- Title 5, section 55204 requires “regular effective contact”; ACCJC requires “regular substantive interaction”
- Instructors must have a presence in the course and a documented interaction with students
- Initiated interaction with students to verify course comprehension and student identity
- DE Courses are considered the equivalent of face to face classes
  - Synchronous and asynchronous communication

Student Authentication (ACCJC Required)

- DE Task Force working on it:
  - Single Sign-On Authentication
  - Proctored exams
  - Initiated interaction with students
  - Academic Honesty Policy that includes DE
  - Writing or work samples at the start of class
  - Plagiarism Detection Software like Turn it In

Where to Now?

- Finalize existing documents and get constituent group approvals
- Union drafts and negotiates Contract and Evaluation Instruments
- Continue to train on campus to technology, pedagogy and policy
- Work on DE student support with appropriate groups
  - Counseling, Tutorial, Library, Financial Aid, DSPS
- Write ACCJC Self Study
- Write Substantive Change Request
- Prepare for new Student Achievement Requirements

Other Options

- Create Dean of Distance Education with assignment rights (PCC, Handcock model)
  - Require Teaching Demonstration
- Negotiate Minimum Quals. for Distance Education Instructors and develop way to enforce
- Others?
Further Information

- ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education
- WASC Substantive Change Model
- Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates
- American Federation of Teachers Distance Education: Guidelines for Good Practice