ACADEMIC SENATE

Adopted Minutes

October 17, 2011
Board Room 626
3:00 pm –5:00 pm

1. Call to Order
President Thom Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call:
Thomas Watkins, President
Abla Christiansen, Nick Cittadino, Dale Crandall-Bear – *ex officio*, Susanna Crawford, Joe Conrad – *ex officio*, Tracy Fields, LaNae Jaimez, Richard Kleeberg, Lou McDermott, Amy Obegi, Melissa Reeve
Absent/Excused: Scott Parrish
Guests: Jowel Laguerre, Arturo Reyes, Chris Myers, Jeff Lamb, John Urrutia, Sandra Rotenberg

Connie Adams, Interim Admin Assistant

3. Approval of Agenda – October 17, 2011
Motion to Approve – Senator Reeves; Seconded – Senator McDermott; Passed – Unanimous

4. Approval of Minutes (none)

5. Comments from the Public

6. President's Report
President Watkins reminded Senators of the following meetings:
State Senate Area B meeting, Friday, October 21, from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at Santa Rosa Junior College. Please contact President Watkins if you plan to attend.
EMP (Educational Master Plan) meeting, Monday, October 31, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the back half of the cafeteria.
EMP follow-up meeting, Monday, November 28, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the back half of the cafeteria. The third and final master plan meeting with the Senate will be held sometime in January.

Accreditation Team Visit: President Watkins reported that the Accreditation team has requested to meet with the Academic Senate. The meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 25, from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room.

President's Watkins asked DE Chair Crandall-Bear to add S/P Laguerre to the DE timeline for review of the tentative RFP list before it is forwarded to VP Yulian Ligioso on November 3.
Chair Crandall-Bear confirmed that the RFP list will be forwarded to everyone before the winter break.

7. Reports
7.1 Superintendent/President Jowel Laguerre
No report

8. Action Items
8.1 DE Representation Reorganization
The DE Reorganization was discussed at the October 3rd Senate meeting, which culminated in overall agreement with the plan based on the Senate necessity and DE agreement to change the two student voting positions to advisory vote positions. Chair Crandall-Bear confirmed that change was made. Senator Kleeberg reminded Senators that the revised Bylaws will allow the Academic Senate to change representation as needed by the Senate without requiring a full faculty vote. The Senate subcommittees will similarly make changes by their membership vote, followed by Senate vote. Motion to accept

1

the DE reorganization proposal as presented on October 3rd and amended as noted – Senator Kleeberg; Seconded – Vice President Crawford; Passed – Unanimous.

9.   Information/Discussion Items
   9.1   Integrated Planning Process (IPP) – Chris Myers
Chris Myers, Planning & Research Interim Director, reviewed the IPP (Integrated Planning Process) with the Senate. He noted that few changes have been made since he last brought a presentation to the Senate. Mr. Myers distributed a packet which included: Solano College Integrated Planning Process (IPP) for Evaluation, Planning, and Budgeting; Program Review Process and Timeline; Three-Year Plan Process and Timeline; Strategic/Operational Proposal Process and Timeline; IPP Calendar; a Where to Find resource list, and; an IPP brochure from a couple years ago. It is important that Senators understand the process and can share the information with their constituents.   The first diagram presented an overview of the IPP. The state budget includes things happening in education in general, in technology and other external items that affect the College. Internally, Planning & Research is part of the evaluation process. Strategic plans feed into three-year and College-wide plans. The majority of plans have resources available and the other plans would process through strategic/operational proposals.   Once plans are implemented, they cycle back around to evaluation.
Comments/Questions:
Senators appreciated the new "cleaner and clearer" chart Mr. Myers created. Vice President Crawford queried if the overarching planning process is lost with so many unarticulated groups and plans flowing through. Mr. Meyers responded groups are encouraged to look at all other plans that could be impacted by or could impact the plan going through the process. Programs that need additional resources proceed through the proposal process. He explained that the Accreditation Plan agenda is part of the self-study to maintain what the College is doing and to make improvements. Senator McDermott requested that this topic be brought back for more in depth review because of limited time on this agenda. Mr. Myers shared quick overviews of the other documents. Senator Christiansen expressed concern about confusion with one and three-year plans as well as proposal timelines. She added that the Senators need a better understanding to communicate with constituents so that everyone can respond properly as items come up. Mr. Myers created a calendar (included in packet) which should help. The Senate will invite Planning & Research back again when more time can be allotted to review the IPP.

   9.2   Accreditation Team Visit – EVP Reyes and Dean
EVP Reyes reported that an eleven member Accreditation team will visit Solano College from Monday afternoon, October 24, through Thursday, October 27.   The College received a list of people and groups that the visiting members would like to interview, some of whom may receive requests for information before Monday.   There will be a welcome reception and the Career Center will house their operations.
Dean Lamb presented a power point to familiarize everyone with the different standards. While briefing Senators through the presentation, Dean Lamb pointed out: the strategic plan is the core to decision making; student learning outcomes are at the core of the College mission and make classroom instruction key for the planning process; evaluations are not currently up-to-date but are planned to be completed by December; STAC (Strategic Technology Advisory Council) has been formed and will have a final draft ready today; the College has seen positive strides and now has a good working Governing Board; individuals have written ideas for improvement which have been interrelated, interconnected, and highlighted where they fit into the planning process; the planning agenda was decreased from 180+ items to four broad and general items which are linked back to the long list, and; the College has had many great plans that were not always implemented or evaluated well and that process is now being improved. Dean Lamb pointed out the significance that the District has allocated $100,000 to IPP as well as funds for professional development.
EVP Reyes expressed his appreciation of how well the Senate members work cooperatively together at Solano College. That is often not the case in many colleges and he added that that is important information to share with the visiting team.

   9.3   Senate Elections / Term Limits (3:40 pm)
Nominations are needed for one at-large and one part-time senator. President Watkins will send an email to all faculty members to request nominations.

   9.4   Curriculum Committee Reorganization Proposal – Joe Conrad (3:50 pm)
The Curriculum Committee Reorganization proposal was emailed to Senators and distributed at this meeting. Senators had a brief review and discussion and expressed general agreement. President Watkins pointed out the proposal statement regarding the process to stagger terms, which he had also discussed with the Senate.

9.5 Computer Science – John Urrutia

Senators received a copy of the Two-Part College Policy for Computer Software proposal and John Urrutia, Computer Science Professor, gave a summarized report. There has not been an official procedure for updating needed software. This problem has affected computer science, physics, drafting, art, math, and other courses. Procedures are needed that outline a process for exceptions to the College software and hardware. Although it is understandable that faculty shouldn't randomly add programs, they need to be enabled to make timely requests for what is needed to properly do their jobs. To stay on course with changes that occur about every 18 months, software needs to be up-to-date and CIS faculty members need access to software six to nine months ahead of schedule. Arbitrary decisions and inflexible College-wide policies create problems for academics instruction in some departments.

Comments/Questions: Senator Reeve recently had conversations with colleagues in the art department who have to purchase their own programs and sees that one size fits all is not a reality. Senator McDermott suggested that, prior to the beginning of the academic year, IT could find out what programs faculty need loaded, which is the practice at Cal Maritime. He added that it should be a college responsibility. Mr. Urrutia replied that around 2000-2004, his division had two servers and part-time staff to maintain it and support computer science. Currently there is no support and the faculty does not have access to those servers purchased by the division, which creates a problem for faculty when they need to evaluate new software. Senators agreed that a solution is needed and Senator Kleeberg suggested the formation of a subcommittee. This item will be addressed at the next regular Senate meeting.

9.6 LMS Presentations – Dale Crandall-Bear and Sandra Rotenberg (4 pm)

DE Chair Crandall-Bear presented overviews of several DE researched LMS platforms. He reported that the DE Committee and some online faculty members have attended platform demos and have worked with demo versions of platforms (Blackboard and Moodlerooms demos are not available yet) to experience how they work. Chair Crandall-Bear took one of his current online classes, stripped the material into plain text, loaded it into the platforms, and spent two hours in each which helped test ease of use. He found some to have a huge advantage by being intuitive and user friendly which would save a lot of training time and expense. He presented views of the main unit page, topics, schedule, threaded discussions (which can be far more involved online than discussions in class), reading room (lists reading assignments), and lecture hall.

Chair Crandall-Bear commented:

1. *Desire2Learn* – have to click on content to get to the course.
2. *Etudes* – most difficult, not very intuitive, bare bones in structure, some parallels to Desire2Learn
3. *Canvas* – clearly emerging as favorite. It is elegant with features others don't have, open source, remarkably efficient, and incorporates the newest technologies. Canvas features include:
   - Materials for all courses an instructor teaches can be viewed in one place or one class can be selected to see material for that class only.
   - All recent activity is shown in one place.
   - Students have same type of view capability.
   - Students set profile and notification page for receiving messages with no extra work for instructors.
   - Students view complete stream of comments, including audio/video, when logged in.
   - Canvas has a built-in conference or other conference programs could be used.
   - Students can see everything the instructor puts on the screen and can listen live to comments.
   - Calendar is similar to Google calendars.
   - Speed grader can include live rubric and addition of points and comments.
   - Discussion area includes all comments.
   - Attachment files can be downloaded and uploaded easily without saving in another place.
   - Video and audio comments can be attached.
   - If the same correction is needed in more than one section, it can be set up for all sections at once.
   - Instructors report features save 10-12 hours for each assignment.
   - Tablets are compatible and iPods and iPhones will be soon. Canvas is usually the first one incorporating new tools and upgrades and offers incredible tools for faculty.
   - Canvas is fairly new and has been open source for two years. The large Maricopa district in Arizona signed with them. Ms. Rotenberg has a list of other schools using Canvas and expects they'll have many more when Blackboard customers look for new solutions as their current system reaches end of life.
4. *eCollege* – updates only about every four years, the other platforms update often and hold major updates for semester breaks and is one of the higher cost systems.

Chair Crandall-Bear noted that although this review project began out of budgetary concerns, the DE Committee has been delighted to see a lot of new technical potential. He added that Accreditation wants to see ongoing interaction between

instructors and students and Canvas archives everything automatically from wherever it comes (Facebook, email etc.). It is important to identify at-risk students at the beginning to impact success rates and Canvas offers many tools to work with students who have a slow start. He concluded that other programs have some similar tools but are not as robust as Canvas.

Comments/Questions:
Senator Reeve suggested the messaging capabilities would be beneficial as eCompanions for all instructors and counseling could also be offered online. Ms. Rotenberg agreed and added financial aid could be handled online as well. Senator Cittadino noted the convenience of having everything in one place, unlike Blackboard and others that have multiple programs for various tasks. Ms. Rotenberg will check if Canvas retains grade book information from dropped students per Senator Kleeberg's request.

DE Coordinator Rotenberg presented a power point with pricing information and a summary of the pros and cons of each platform and added the following comments:
- o The new proprietary Blackboard 9.1 is much better than anything they've had before with many tools (some with additional costs) that Canvas has.
- o Canvas charges extra for user support which they say most schools don't use. They have a uTube channel that shows faculty and students how to do anything. Instructure, the company that provides Canvas support, is very innovative.
- o Internal College support was considered but because it would be costly, the program would need to be up 24/7, and other complex reasons considered, it does not look feasible.
- o More exact prices will be obtained once the RFP is submitted.
- o Desire2Learn has been speaking with the Chancellor's Office regarding pricing for the state. It is a good proprietary system that is used by eight or so state community colleges.
- o Etudes was started by faculty at Foothill College and is now used by 25 state community colleges. They offer a half year free trial. The platform is very basic and has good tools for student progress, but not as good as Canvas or Desire2Learn. Etudes handles all administrative tasks which would allow the coordinator time to do other tasks, such as innovative training.
- o Moodlerooms was the least impressive and they don't include support or mobile application. They are open source and contract with a third party (unnamed) for support and they don't know the costs. That leaves it impossible to evaluate and know who would be held responsible.
- o eCollege is being used for the LMS review. The LMS Review links, including sandbox and faculty needs survey, can be accessed at www.solanonline.org. The Committee would appreciate more feedback and requested faculty take the survey.

10.   Action Reminders

11.   Announcements

12.   Adjournment
Motion to Adjourn – Vice President Crawford; Seconded – Senator Cittadino
The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

AS Minutes 10.17.11/ca