Faculty Senates Coordinating Council
of the Contra Costa Community College District
500 Court Street, Martinez California 94553

FSCC Chair: DVC Academic Senate President: John Freytag, **jfreytag@dvc.edu,** ext 22509
CCC Academic Senate President: Gabriela Segade, **gsegade@contracosta.edu**, ext 44926
LMC Academic Senate Co-Presidents: Louie Giambattista, **lgiambattista@losmedanos.edu**, ext 37791;
and Adrianna Simone, **asimone@losmedanos.edu**, ext 37874

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">

REVISED - Faculty Senates Coordinating Council Meeting Agenda
February 11, 2025
10:30 AM
Ross Conference Room, Sixth Floor, 500 Court Street, Martinez
* ZOOM link for members of the public, guest presenters, and exempted members only:
https://4cd.zoom.us/j/85867230362 and below.

</td></tr>
</table>

1.	**APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THE FEBRUARY 11, 2025, MEETING AND MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 1/7** (discussion/**action**)
2.	**PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC** (information only) **All Meetings Are Open – Everyone Welcome**
3.	**ANNOUNCEMENTS/COUNCIL COMMENT** (information only)
4.	**COLLEGE/ACADEMIC SENATE UPDATES** (information/discussion) CCC – Segade reported CCC Senate was joined by Chair of Philosophy Dept. to report on an issue where a colleague was put on admin. leave with three courses left uncovered. 2 of 3 were staffed by a manager w/o consulting Chair which is against the uniform hiring guide and UF contract. Council will reaffirm importance of faculty. ASCCC Academic Academy and Plenary attendance was discussed with some interested in attending. Council decided to have a Faculty Collegiality Day again this semester on a Friday. Found a nominee for the CCCOE TOY Award. DVC – Council discussed its web presence following the updated DVC website, were joined by ASCCC President, Cheryl Aschenbach, to recognize OER@DVC program and its coordinators, reviewed our Sp'25 enrollment patterns, and continued to discuss what support is needed to support faculty as they adapt to the AI world. Provided recommended dates for administering the NACCC survey this Spring, discussed Program Review Reimagined proposal, and extended the curriculum prioritization process through Spring 2027 LMC – Senate has met once: AI Briefing from Roseann Erwin who is now officially their rep on District AI Taskforce as well as the LMC AI Taskforce. Briefed Council on AI Policy. Finally got reassignments agreed upon and will be sent out soon. District being more stringent on modality of positions (remote vs. on campus). Worked through most of FSA review and approvals. Discussed eminence and inclusion in our equivalency processes and where we want to be with the Educational Planning Reports (integrated in entire process vs. notification towards end).
5.	**REVIEW/DISCUSS FEBRUARY 11 DGC AGENDA** (information/discussion)

6.	**PROPOSED POLICY AND PROCEDURE CHANGES** (information/discussion; **action may be taken**)
	1. [BP 3013](#) -Student Records, Directory Information, and Privacy (revise)
	2. [SS 3026](#) - Student Records and Directory Information (revise)
	3. [BP 1020](#) - Conflict of Interest (revise)
	4. [AP 1020.01](#) - Conflict of Interest (revise)
	Reviewed proposed revisions and are comfortable moving BP 3013 and SS 3026 forward today. Will get feedback from UF leadership re: BP 1020 and AP 1020.01.
7.	**EDUCATIONAL PLANNING REPORTS** (information/discussion; **action may be taken**)
	1. Roles of Academic Senates and Senate leaders
	LMC first discussed at their 2/3 meeting. From leadership perspective wants to have senate be directly involved with report development. Will discuss during next Consultation. Council is considering how involved it wants to be with report writing and development process. Would a Senate approval be a rubber stamp or an actual review and approval?
	CCC didn't discuss much due to a full agenda. Segade noted that all program reviews go through Planning Committee and one way to ensure faculty participation would be to ask Dean of Planning to present to Senate Council what their feedback is regarding program viability.
	Could senates be involved with determination of the review criteria for determining "on watch" or "in trouble" programs. FSCC will review 4008 at a future meeting and consider proposing revision so that, at Senate President's discretion, senate leadership or designee can choose to be part of report development discussions.
8.	**REGULAR AND SUBSTANTIVE INTERACTION** (information/discussion)
	1. College updates; looking ahead
	Colleges making strides in increasing awareness about RSI
	Joined by Emma Rogers: Need to encourage colleges to increase investment in PD to help faculty understand what RSI entails in different disciplines. PD team to coordinate with departments to create guidelines about what weekly engagement looks like in their courses. Need to meet an 85% threshold at next ACCJC visit (Fa'26 courses will be examined Sp'27).
	Talking with UF about training requirements. Building a districtwide RSI course that will ask faculty to review one of their courses for RSI standards. Will map out different types of RSI that can be used and integrated into SLOs.
	DEDEC to create district wide resources and partner with college level teams (DEDE Committees). RSI not heavily weighted in current online evaluation forms/processes. Need to look at evaluation procedures with a more nuanced eye and revisit forms to reflect
	Any district-level funds to support RSI efforts? This is an opportunity for us to partner and advocate with College leadership to invest in RSI training. Faculty need more support to get their courses up to standards, not just for ACCJC.
9.	**SUPPORTING FACULTY AND INSTRUCTION IN AN AI WORLD** (information/discussion)
	1. Status template syllabus, acceptable use policies at each college
	2. Roles of senates and committee leadership

10.	USE/MODERATION OF ALL FACULTY EMAIL DISTRIBUTION LISTS (information/discussion; **action may be taken**) No discussion. Will remove this item from next agenda.
11.	APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES, TASK FORCES, OR OTHER GROUPS DEALING WITH 10+1 MATTERS (information/discussion) Remove from next agenda.

12.	STATUS OF SENATE DISCUSSIONS REGARDING 4CD EQUIVALENCY PROCESSES, EMINENCE (information/discussion)
	     a. Including eminence in our equivalency processes see example from [Chabot Las-Positas CCD here](#)).
	     b. Collection of department equivalency standard information.
	         a. [Disciplines Requiring a Master's Degree](#)
	         b. [Disciplines Not Requiring a Master's Degree](#)
	         c. [ASCCC CTE Faculty MQs Toolkit](#)

13.	OPEN FACULTY POSITIONS ON DGC (information/discussion; **action may be taken**)
14.	ADJOURNMENT – NEXT MEETING MARCH 4, 2025.

Topic: FSCC Meeting
Time: February 11, 2025, 10:30 AM
In-person location: Ross Conference Room, Sixth Floor, 500 Court Street, Martinez
<mark>ZOOM link for members of the public, guest presenters, and exempted members only:</mark>
Join Zoom Meeting: https://4cd.zoom.us/j/85867230362

Fa'24, Sp'25 Meeting Dates: ~~8/6, 9/3, 10/1, 11/5, 12/3, 1/7/25,~~ 2/11, 3/4, 4/1, 5/5, 6/3

From Zoom AI Companion:

Quick recap

The meeting focused on the setup of the conference room, the agenda for the upcoming District Governance Council meeting, and the review of district policies and procedures, particularly those related to conflicts of interest and outside employment. The team also discussed the development of educational bag reports, the involvement of the LMC Senate in the process, and the issue of program reviews and the involvement of the Academic Senate. Lastly, they discussed the status of AI syllabus language templates, acceptable use policies, and the interpretation and application of certain rules and requirements.

Next steps

• FSCC to review Board Policy 4008 at a future meeting and consider proposing revisions to allow Senate Presidents discretion in being part of educational program review report discussions.
• DO to approach district leadership about securing funding and support for regular and substantive interaction (RSI) training and implementation.
• College Senates to advocate with local administration for investment in RSI training and support.

• Emma to work with DDEC to create district-wide RSI resources and partner with local college DE committees.
• Union and district to form a work group to revise online evaluation forms to better reflect RSI standards when Article 27 reopens in fall.
• College AI task forces to review and potentially modify the DVC sample AI policy syllabus language for use at their colleges.
• DO to remove "Use/moderation of all-faculty email distribution list" item from future agendas.
• College Senates to continue discussions on including eminence in equivalency processes and defining eminence.

Summary

DGC Meeting Agenda and Policies
The council reviews the agenda for the upcoming District Governance Council (DGC) meeting. They discuss several items, including a strategic plan update, budget update, and first readings of policies and procedures. The council focuses on three policies: BP 3013 on student records and privacy, BP 3015, and BP 3026. They are familiar with BP 3013 from previous discussions and are comfortable with it moving forward. The other two policies are new to the council and require further review. They also note a proposed revision to the 2024-25 DGC calendar due to a religious holiday conflict.

District Policies, Conflicts of Interest
The meeting involved a detailed discussion about the district's policies and procedures, particularly focusing on the potential conflicts of interest and the implications of outside employment. The team discussed the need for clarity and transparency in the policies, with a focus on ensuring that district employees are not engaging in activities that could be seen as conflicting with their duties. There was also a discussion about the potential for employees to be double-dipping, working multiple jobs, and the need for a clear evaluation process to address such issues. The team also touched on the topic of AI work and the potential need for employees to disclose any outside AI work. The conversation ended with the team expressing a need to defer to the Union for further guidance on these issues.

Educational Planning Reports and Senate Involvement
The meeting discussed the development of educational bag reports and the involvement of the LMC Senate in this process. The LMC President, Pamela, had conversations with Adriana about the Senate's potential involvement in the development of the reports. The LMC Senate expressed a desire to be more involved in the process, but the exact level of involvement was not decided. The FSDC remains concerned about the potential implications of involving the Senate in the approval process, as it could lead to faculty members petitioning against certain programs. The conversation ended with the need for further discussions and decisions on the matter.

Program Reviews and Academic Senate
The discussion revolved around the issue of program reviews and the involvement of the Academic Senate in the process. The participants discussed the need for a more

structured procedure for program reviews and the involvement of the Academic Senate in the decision-making process. They also discussed the potential for tying program reviews to the 5-year cycle and the need for a more comprehensive approach to program reviews. The participants agreed to review the 4008 policy in a future meeting and consider proposing revisions to it. They also discussed the need for regular and substantive interactions, with a focus on the criteria for such interactions. The conversation ended with a discussion on the need for a more rigorous approach to program reviews and the involvement of the Academic Senate in the process.

Promoting RSI Awareness and Guidelines
Emma discussed the need for increased awareness and understanding of RSI (Regular and Substantial Interaction) among faculty members, particularly in online courses. She suggested that the district should invest in professional development and create guidelines for RSI in different disciplines. Emma also mentioned the development of a district-wide course on RSI and the potential revision of evaluation forms to better reflect the new RSI standards. She emphasized the need for advocacy and support from local colleges to invest in training and infrastructure for equitable online education. Lastly, she clarified that faculty members would not be aware if their courses were selected for review during the accreditation process.

AI Syllabus, Policies, and Moderation
The meeting discussed the status of AI syllabus language templates and acceptable use policies. The team agreed to review and potentially modify the AI policy before presenting it to the Senate. They also discussed the moderation of faculty email distribution lists, deciding not to create or moderate a platform for this purpose. Lastly, the team discussed the status of Senate discussion regarding the course of equivalence components, with a focus on the inclusion of imminence in the process and the need for a definition. The team agreed to continue the discussion in their next meeting.

Addressing Rule Interpretation and Application
DO expressed concerns about the interpretation and application of certain rules and requirements, particularly in relation to academic qualifications and documentation. He highlighted the issue of managers using certain clauses to justify decisions, which could lead to awkward situations. DO suggested that district HR personnel should be consulted before decisions are made to ensure they align with the intended purpose. He also discussed specific cases, such as a culinary degree applicant and a real estate license holder, where the documentation and proof of experience were problematic. DO emphasized that the equivalency process should not be circumvented and that the hiring process should be transparent.