Agenda Items	Activities and Outcome		
Present:	**Committee 2020-21**		
	Ashley Arnold F (AFA)	Lisa Beach A (Co-chair by position)	Katie Seder F
	Paulette Bell F	Michael Roth EX	Mary-Catherine Oxford A
	Alice Hampton F	Catherine Williams F (P)	Amanda Greene F
	Jessica Harris F	Debbie Gonnella C	Liko Puha C
	Jurgen Kremer F (Faculty Co-chair)	Michele Larkey C	Michelle Vidaurri EX
	Salvador Rico F	Kerry Loewen A	

Conversation with Academic Senate President, Julie Thompson and AFA President, Sean Martin (30 mins.)	• Online expertise – title 5 and Board Policy
	   a. It was stated that online expertise deals with bargaining decisions and that it is a matter for the Senate and the AFA to discuss. It is not appropriate for a shared-governance committee.
	   b. A suggestion was made that any concerns about this issue needs to be taken to our administration.
	   c. This issue does not seem to be currently being negotiated by AFA. It is hard to give a timeline about when this will be discussed.
	• Office hours/response times
	   a. This concerns Article 17. It is also a negotiable item.
	   b. DOC initially started discussing this issue because of students going to the Board reporting inconsistency and lack of clarity about instructors' office hours and class meeting times.
	   c. From AFA, it was stated that there is a potential that members of the Board can come to DOC instead of following proper channels. This would violate rights of faculty. It was recommended that students need to bring their concerns to our administration.
	• Class meeting times
	   a. Also a negotiable item to be addressed by the Senate and AFA.
	• Instructional software
	• DE staffing support for faculty
	• Other Q&A from committee members
	   a. There were no additional questions.		

Online expertise follow up (20 mins.)	• A comment was made that there seems to be lack of clarity about roles of committees. • Question: Do all documents that get posted on the website need to be negotiated? • Questions from both faculty and students posed to DOC about these issues is the motivation of DOC to have this discussion. Maybe what needs to happen is that the faculty members of DOC need to take this to the Senate and have this conversation there instead of with DOC.		

	• It was stated that when students have issues with instructors, they do not always contact the instructor first. Also, students might not allow a reasonable amount of time for instructors to respond to their questions/requests. • It is hard to know the difference between items concerning the Senate and shared-governance committees. This confusion will likely happen again.
Approval of minutes December 9, 2020 and February 10, 2020 meeting (send with agenda)	•
Resolution regarding DE staffing (send with agenda) (20 mins.)	• Resolution on the agenda: Increase permanent positions in DE to support faculty and students. • **Motion carried**: Kerry Loewen motioned to approve this resolution. Catherine Williams seconded. • About the process that led to the draft of this resolution: Data taken from SAS revealed dramatic increase in usage, yet the level of institutional Canvas support has remained the same. There is only one Canvas support person. • Before the pandemic, the percentage of online offerings was around 12% and it is now 98%. • In some departments, some part-times have been hired using temporary funds, such as CARES. This process is unstable. These trained part-timers often leave our institution soon. This process drains time and energy from full-time employees who train these temporary ones. • We would like to determine how long the need to increase DE positions, has been identified in PRPP by DE. • Question: Can we determine the turnover rate of temporary faculty who have been trained and leave? • We acknowledge that there is a budget crisis, so this is not going to be an easy discussion. Two-year colleges have, overall, suffered in their enrollment. • Our district is probably rethinking the role of DE because it has become larger. • Filling these positions might require relocation of resources. • These positions might involve re-engineering. Somebody with certain strengths can be trained to fill these positions. A concern is that replacing positions hurts other areas. • A budgetary crisis is acknowledged, but something needs to be done. • All the comments and feedback will be considered regarding this issue and will be talked about next time. • **Motion carried**: Jurgen Kremer motioned to table this discussion. Kerry Loewen seconded.

Instructional Software (20 mins.)	• Survey
	   a. We had 10 people complete the survey. Results were emailed. Best estimation of cost was added to the list. They were given to Kate Jolly. We do not know what exactly the outcome will be regarding funding. Results are in Teams.
	• Subcommittee report
	   a. Selection criteria
	   b. Budget process/needs
	   c. Support/integration

	• The subcommittee met and the document with selection criteria, budget process/needs, and support/integration was emailed to all DOC members. • Instructor initiates the process by proposing it first to the department. If the department agrees, it brings it to DOC. • Question about the review process: The path is proposed to be from faculty to department to DOC. Is there an alternative channel for departments such as Distance Ed? That is, from DE to DOC, not to necessarily go through the department. In other words, DE might need a route to purchase software too. • These might be two different topics. The topic currently addressed is software from faculty, instructional software. DE, or other employees purchasing software might be a different topic. • At what point does instructional software get reviewed for privacy issues? Who reviews it? Does it need to be by the union? • Use of most of software is optional, not mandatory. Faculty do not have to use it. So, privacy issues in software might not need negotiation, because no software is mandatory. However, there seems to be confusion about this. • An instance where negotiation might be required involves the software Pisces. Tutors are recorded tutoring students. It is part of the job. This might require negotiation. • Conversations can get side tracked. We do not want to get side tracked by including software used by all employees in this conversation.
Current issue check-in	•
New business	•
Future business	• What about the review process of instructional software? There seem to be issues regarding scope. We might need to work on that and will pick it up in the future. The subcommittee might need to meet again. • **Motion carried:** Catherine Williams made the motion to conclude the meeting. Amanda Greene seconded. • Meeting ended at 2:50 PM

Committee Function [CF]: 1) Promote the knowledge and understanding of Distance Education across the District. 2) Provide a forum for the discussion of and assisting with online issues related to curriculum development, faculty training, and faculty support. 3) Conduct regular assessment to determine online learning needs. 4) Develop and recommend District policy and procedures in the area of online learning. 5) Maintain a set of best practice recommendations for online instruction. 6) Provide input on the Online Learning website. 7) Provide advice as requested on matters related to online instruction. 8) Consult with the Educational Planning & Coordinating Council (EPCC) on matters related to online instruction.