



# College of the Canyons Academic Senate

March 12, 2026

3:00 p.m. to 4:50 p.m.

Hybrid Format, via Zoom & in-person in BONH 330

## Join Zoom Meeting

<https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/82944492894?pwd=VEsTAWCAYGxMuhQNI5saxRfNnaKZPd.1>

Meeting ID: 829 4449 2894; Passcode: 305922

One tap mobile +1-669-444-9171 US; +M1-253-215-8782 US (Tacoma)

## AGENDA

**Notification:** *The meetings may be audio recorded for note taking purposes. These recordings are deleted once the meeting summary is approved by the Academic Senate.*

**ADA statement:** If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in the public meeting, or if you need an agenda in an alternate form, please contact the Academic Senate Office at [academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu](mailto:academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu) College of the Canyons

### A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
  - *This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Academic Senate on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Public questions or comments can be submitted via email at [academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu](mailto:academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu) or asked via zoom chat feature.*
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Committee Appointments:
  - Revisions to existing Tenure Committees (pg. 10)
  - Urvashi Juneja, Faculty Co-Chair, Technology committee
5. Sub-Committee Summaries:
  - Program Viability Committee meeting summary, February 26, 2026 (pg. 7-9)
6. Approval of the Consent Calendar

I. Academic Senate Meeting Summary, February 26, 2026 (pg. 3-6)	II. <a href="#">Curriculum Committee Summary, March 5, 2026</a>
---	---

### B. Reports

*These are informational items no discussion or action will be taken. However, clarification questions are welcomed.*

1. Scholarly Presentation Committee Annual Chair Report, Pamela Williams-Paez
2. Academic Senate Presidents Report, Lisa Hooper
3. Communications Officer Report, Erica Seubert

### C. Action Items

*Below is a list of items that the Senate will take action on. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.*

1. Request for additional Discipline Assignment, Erica Seubert (Non-Credit Education) (pg. 11)
2. Syllabi Best Practices, CETL Sub-Committee, Robert Wonsler & Victoria Leonard (pg. 12-20)

### D. Discussion

*Below are items that the Senate will discuss and no action will be taken. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.*

1. AFT Contract Changes Impacting Full-Time faculty, Miranda Zamudio

2. Proposed revisions to the Faculty Evaluation Instrument, Lisa Hooper & Julie Johnson
  - I. Summary of the discussion (pg. 21-27)
  - II. [Full-Time Faculty Professional and Instructional Evaluation](#) (pg. 28-31)
    - a. Current Classroom Visitation Report (pg. 32-35)
    - b. Online and Hybrid Visitation Report (pg. 36-39)
  - III. [New Guide for Self-Evaluation Tenured and Tenured Track Faculty](#) (pg. 40-41)
    - a. Current Guide to Self-Evaluation Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty (pg. 42)

#### E. Unfinished Business

*Below is a list of items that can be discussed for a future date.*

1. IRC Discussion - Automated Book Adoptions
2. Web Design/Senate Sub-Committee pages update
3. BP/AP 4300 Field Trips

#### F. New Future Business

*Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.*

1. Tenure Committee Training Workshops
2. Academic Accommodation Liaison to the Senate

#### G. Announcements

- [Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates Spring 2026](#): March 26<sup>th</sup>, April 16<sup>th</sup>, April 30<sup>th</sup>, May 14<sup>th</sup> & May 28<sup>th</sup>
- **Nominations** will open on Monday, March 16, 2026, for Academic Senate School/Division and Adjunct Senator seats, as well as Curriculum Committee School/Division, Adjunct, and At-Large representative positions for the 2026–2028 term.
- [2026 ASCCC Spring Plenary](#), April 9<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, Santa Rosa, CA.
- [2026 Faculty Leadership Institute](#), June 11<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, Long Beach, CA.
- [2026 Curriculum Institute](#), July 15<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, Sacramento Convention Center
- [2026 ASCCC Non-Credit Institute](#), April 30<sup>th</sup> – May 1<sup>st</sup>, San Jose Marriot
- [Association of Community and Continuing Education \(ACCE\) Conference](#), March 11<sup>th</sup> – March 13<sup>th</sup>, The Dana in Mission Bay in San Diego, CA.

#### H. Adjournment

The teleconference is accessible through the following link:

<https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/82944492894?pwd=VEsTAWCAYGxMuhQNI5saxRfNnaKZPd.1>

**Please note:**

**This meeting will be broadcasted at the following locations via zoom**

*None*

## Academic Senate Meeting Summary for February 26, 2026

Vice President	Garrett Rieck	X	Learning Resources Senator	Jennifer Thompson	X
Curriculum Chair	Tricia George	X	Personal & Professional Learning Senator	Garrett Rieck	X
Policy Review Chair	Gary Collis	X	Public Safety	Jessica Crowley	X
Communications Officer	Erica Seubert	X	At Large Senator	Alene Terzian-Zeitounian	X
AT Senator	Regina Blasberg	X	At Large Senator	Erin Delaney	X
MSHP-MSE Senator	Thomas Gisel	X	At Large Senator	Rebecca Shepherd	X
MSHP-HPPS Senator	Lak Dhillon	X	At Large Senator	Shane Ramey	X
VAPA Senator	David Brill	X	At Large Senator	Alexandra Dimakos	X
Student Services Senator	Jesse Vera	X	Adjunct Senator	Todd Fatta	A
Humanities Senator	Mike Harutunian	X	Adjunct Senator	Lauren Rome	X
Kinesiology/Athletics Senator	Kathrina Almero-Fabros	X	Adjunct Senator	Linda Beauregard-Vasquez	X
SBS Senator	Jennifer Paris	X	X= Present	A= Absent	

Non-voting Members				
Dr. David Vakil (Interim, CIO)	X	Jennifer Brezina VP of Instruction		X
Marilyn Jimenez	X	Jason Burgdorfer (COCA President)		X
Dan Portillo (AFT President) <i>Via Zoom</i>	X	ASG Student Representative: Areesh Fatima (Via Zoom)		X

Guest							
Cassidy Butow	X	Dianne Avery	X	Karyl Kicenski	X	Robert Wonser	X
Chad Peters	X	Dilek Sanver-Wang	X	Maral Markarian	X	Ruth Rassool	X
Christ Boltz	X	Garrett Hooper	X	Michael Felix	X	SB Tucker	X
Collette Gibson	X	Jeremey Patrich	X	Michelle LaBrie	X	Victoria Leonard	X
Cyndi Trudea	X	Joe Gerda	X	Mireya Milian	X		X

### A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 3:00 pm
2. Public Comment
  - I. There is concern that there are not enough parking spaces for the disabled faculty.
  - II. Erin has walked some of the UCEN office spaces and identified a better set up for faculty. David Vakil and Lisa Hooper will walk this space next.
3. Approval of the Agenda:
  - I. There was an error on the curriculum summary regarding the course title for MEA. This was pulled from the agenda and will be handled at the next Curriculum Committee meeting.
  - II. **Motion** to approve the agenda with the amendment. by Tricia George, seconded by Linda Beauregard-Vasquez. Unanimous. Approved.
4. Committee Appointments:

- I. Sarah Ethridge, School of SBS Representative on the MQE Committee
  - The spelling of the last name will be corrected: “Etheridge”
- II. Tenure Committee for New Full-Time Faculty, Milan Manorat (pg. 14)
- 5. Sub-Committee Summaries:
  - I. Program Viability Committee meeting summary, February 12, 2026 – (pg. 8-10)
  - II. Senate Executive Committee meeting summary, February 19, 2026 (pg. 11-13)
- 6. Approval of the Consent Calendar
  - I. **Motion** to approve the consent calendar by Alexa Dimakos, seconded by Jesse Vera. Unanimous. Approved.

III. Academic Senate Meeting Summary, February 12, 2026 (pg. 3-7)	IV. <a href="#">Curriculum Committee Summary, February 19, 2026</a>
---	---

## B. Reports

*These are informational items no discussion or action will be taken. However, clarification questions are welcomed.*

- 1. Career Education Committee & CE Liaison Annual Chair Report, Regina Blasberg (pg. 15-17)
  - I. **CE Committee Report:** Regina shared that CE students are not required to take CE courses and therefore more marketing is needed. Regina met with Dr. Daylene Meuschke and Jason Hinkle on how to best put forward budget requests. Harriet Happle, CTE Dean is the co-chair of the committee and deals with Perkins and SWF funding. The state cut 22% to all SWF budgets to expand Nursing. The CCA entity is using their lobbyist to try to push the state to put the \$60M back. Students need to be trained on the most current equipment. If students are falling behind this may also be an academic standards issue. There are suggestions on how to develop a process to alleviate this issue and put this in a document.
  - II. **CE Liaison Report:** Regina sits on various campus committees and attends regional meetings for the South-central regional consortium. Recently the consortium met at the CCAOE conference.
- 2. Academic Senate Presidents Report, Lisa Hooper
  - I. **CCC PERT Team:** Lisa is not on this team as this group meets on Senate and PV dates. There are several senators that sit on this team that can represent the Academic Senate. AI is challenging to navigate in higher education as changes are happening very quickly.
  - II. **Academic Standards:** There is a need to discuss modalities within departments and disciplines to determine which modes of best for ensuring learning.
  - III. **Student Conduct Policies:** The recently revised policies went to CPC and ASG where they were approved. We will be looking to form a team of faculty to be ready to serve on “Grade Review” panels. John LeJay has been invited to Senate to discuss how his area will be overseeing these changes.
  - IV. **Standardized Attendance Accounting process:** Dr. Brezina will present on this new method and how it will impact scheduling.
  - V. **Dept. Chair Training:** COCFA and AFT Contracts is the next session on 3/6.
  - VI. **Shared Governance Council:** There is training for all members of the PAT teams. First session is tomorrow, but there are plans for additional training sessions.
  - VII. **GENSLER/CANYONS COMPASS:** Gensler was pleased there was a good group of students from both campuses who participated in the “listening” sessions.
  - VIII. **CEO hiring committee:** The committee will be interviewing candidates the week of March 9<sup>th</sup> and as a result the PV meeting schedule for that week has been cancelled.
  - IX. **PAC-B:** This committee has not met or discussed the Governors May revise. An update will be provided in March.
  - X. **PIO Message:** Special thanks to PIO on the email sent campus wide outlining how everyone can access their services.
  - XI. **Spring 2026 Graduation:** Graduation is set for June 5<sup>th</sup> at 6:00pm. A regalia message went out.

This is the first ceremony that will recognize students graduating with bachelor’s degrees. The honor Gard was not replicated last year but will be replicated to allow faculty to congratulate students. Andy Gumps will be brought in to help manage the restroom demands.

- XII. **Faculty Evaluation Discussion for March 12<sup>th</sup>:** The Senate approved competencies in spring of 2024. The taskforce was to incorporate these into the Faculty Evaluation instruments. These competencies have not been adopted by the district. A new instrument has been negotiated for adjunct faculty. There is concern with having faculty evaluated on different instruments for full-time and part time.
- 3. Vice President Report, Garrett Rieck
  - I. **Faculty Awards nominations** are open, the email sent out, and ends on April 16<sup>th</sup> at 5pm, There are 6 total awards and need to have all documents. Garrett will review all nominations and make sure all is there.
  - II. **Faculty Office:** Lottery will launch after spring break. We are only doing one round. This will run for a week and a half to allow faculty to respond and submit their choices.

**C. Action Items**

*Below is a list of items that the Senate will take action on. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.*

- 1. Adjunct Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies (MQE) List
  - I. Adjunct MQE List Fall 2025 (Part 2) (pg. 18-24)
  - II. Adjunct MQE List Winter 2026 (pg. 25-27)
  - III. Adjunct MQE List Spring 2026 (pg. 28-43)
    - Special thanks to HR and Alsiha Kaminsky for reviewing the lists.
    - **Motion** to approve the Adjunct Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies list by seconded by Lauren Rome, seconded by Linda Beauregard. Unanimous. Approved
- 2. Primer on Academic Freedom, Karyl Kicenski (pg. 44-46)
  - I. Special thanks to Karyl and the committee for all their hard work. The Senate felt it was ready to move forward with the voting process
  - II. **Motion** to approve the Primer on Academic Freedom by Lauren Rome, seconded by Linda Beauregard-Vasquez. Unanimous. Approved.
- 3. Academic Integrity Committee’s Statement on Faculty Use of Artificial Intelligence in Grading and Feedback, Dr. Shane Ramey
  - I. Draft version discussed at the February 12, 2026, Academic Senate Meeting (pg. 47)
  - II. Draft based on feedback received from February 12, 2026, Academic Senate meeting (pg. 48)
    - Both the first draft from the Feb. 12<sup>th</sup> agenda and an updated version are included. However, there is now a third version, Draft A.1. that takes the same language from the first draft but changes one term in an existing sentence, and adds one additional sentence. The AIC committee felt the first preferred version Draft A.1. The committee felt the term “Human agency” encapsulated well what was asked.
    - **Motion** to approve the Academic Integrity Committee’s Statement Draft A.1 on “Faculty Use of Artificial Intelligence in Grading and Feedback” by Regina Blasberg, seconded by Rebecca Shepherd. Unanimous. Approved.

**D. Discussion**

*Below are items that the Senate will discuss and no action will be taken. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.*

- 1. BP/AP 4300 (Field Trips), Gary Collis

I. BP 4300 Field Trips and Excursions (Final for Senate) (pg. 49)	I. BP 4300 (Field Trips and Excursions (Compare Version) (pg. 52)
II. AP 4300 Field Trips and Excursions (Final for Senate) (pg. 50-51)	II. AP 4300 (Current) (pg. 57)

- I. This item came through in November through policy committee, however the process of updating this policy began 3 years ago. There was a proposal to extract much of the content from the current AP and put this into some form of an operation procedure or handbook. The handbook was

presented to the committee and there were some concerns therefore an informal work group was assembled. Administration took notes and were going to make corrections however, a reconvening never took place. The documents are now 15 years old and need to be updated. Dr. Brezina stated that she is unclear if there is a finished draft of the handbook. Faculty need to be consulted as this is a faculty domain.” The suggestion is to have these operating procedures come back to the Policy Review committee for further discussion and congruence with the proposed BP and AP.

2. Syllabi Best Practices, CETL Sub-Committee, Robert Wonser & Victoria Leonard (pg. 58-66)
  - I. CELT felt it best to have a statement on the website on what are the ideal best practices in the creation of a syllabus. The final document would also live on the Academic Senate website. It was suggested to include a table that outlines what is now required, recommended, strongly recommended. It was also suggested to add a column for recommendations for accreditation. Special thanks to CETL and Victoria Leonard for all their hard work.

#### **E. Additional Notes:**

1. Lisa has been working with the Office of Instruction on the Advisory Council.

#### **F. Unfinished Business**

*Below is a list of items that can be discussed for a future date.*

4. Faculty Evaluation Instruments
5. IRC Discussion - Automated Book Adoptions
6. Web Design/Senate Sub-Committee pages update

#### **G. New Future Business**

*Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.*

3. Tenure Committee Training Workshops
4. Department Chair Training Series Schedule

#### **H. Announcements**

- Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates Spring 2026: March 12<sup>th</sup>, March 26<sup>th</sup>, April 16<sup>th</sup>, April 30<sup>th</sup>, May 14<sup>th</sup> & May 28<sup>th</sup>
- [2026 ASCCC Spring Plenary](#), April 9<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, Santa Rosa, CA.
- [2026 Faculty Leadership Institute](#), June 11<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup>, Hyatt Regency, Long Beach, CA.
- [2026 Curriculum Institute](#), July 15<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, Sacramento Convention Center
- [2026 ASCCC Non-Credit Institute](#), April 30<sup>th</sup> – May 1<sup>st</sup>, San Jose Marriot
- [Association of Community and Continuing Education \(ACCE\) Conference](#), March 11<sup>th</sup> – March 13<sup>th</sup>, The Dana in Mission Bay in San Diego, CA.

#### **I. Adjournment:** 4:53 pm.

---

The teleconference is accessible through the following link:

<https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/82944492894?pwd=VEsTAWCAYGxMuhQNI5saxRfNnaKZPd.1>

**Please note:**

**This meeting will be broadcasted at the following locations via zoom**

*none*

# Program Viability Committee Summary

February 26, 2026 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. – Zoom

Voting Committee Members:					
Lisa Hooper	<i>Committee Chair</i>	X	VACANT	<i>Transfer Discipline Rep./At-Large Member</i>	A
Kelly Cude	<i>Enrollment Services/Counseling</i>	X	VACANT	<i>ASG Student Rep.</i>	A
Jason Burgdorfer	<i>MSE, COCFA President</i>	X			
Jaya George	<i>Health Professions</i>	A	<b>Administrator Voting Members</b>		
Jennifer Paris	<i>CTE Rep/ECE Rep/SBS</i>	X	David Vakil	<i>Interim Asst. Superintendent/CIO</i>	A
Jesse Vera	<i>Enrollment Services /Counseling</i>	X	Erin Tague	<i>Assist. Superintendent/VP of Facilities</i>	A
Karl Striepe	<i>SBS/Transfer Discipline Faculty</i>	X	Jason Hinkle	<i>Associate, VP, Business Services</i>	X
Ruth Rassool	<i>Humanities (Adjunct)/AFT Designee</i>	X	VACANT	<i>Assist. Superintendent/VP Tech, Inst. Dev. &amp; Tech Computer Support</i>	A
Tricia George	<i>Curriculum Committee Chair/Humanities</i>	X	<b>A= Absent</b>	<b>X = Present</b>	

Guest:							
Ali Naddafpour	X	Dianne Avery	X	Harriet Happel	X	Marilyn Jimenez	X
Chad Peters	X	Francis Wilbert	X	Jennifer Brezina	X	Nadia Cotti	X
Clinton Slaughter	X	Garrett Rieck	X	Mark Rotondo	X	Natalie Corbet	X

## I. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 10:00am
2. Approval of the 2/12/2026 meeting minutes:
  - i. Motion to approve the meeting minutes by Ruth Rassool seconded by Ali Naddafpour. Unanimous. Approved.
3. Approval of the Agenda:
  - i. Motion to approve the agenda by Kelly Cude, seconded by Ali Naddafpur. Unanimous. Approved.

## II. Reports

1. Report #1: Fire Academy Program, Mark Rotondo & Nadia Cotti:
  - i. **Proposed Program Launch Timeline:** If the accreditation process goes well the goal is for the program to launch in the spring of 2027 and start in fall 2027. Much work has been done with the purchasing of equipment and with state accreditation requirements. The accreditation and approval of the curriculum is the focus.
  - ii. **Curriculum Update:** The curriculum was approved and submitted prior to Mark (Rotondo’s hire) but was missing a bit of information for state approval. It has been updated through our local curriculum processes.
  - iii. **Human Resource Needs:** There are two categories for adjunct staffing. Special thanks to Harriet for hiring people temporarily. There is a need for subject matter experts to come in and instruct students. There is no model for hiring subject matter experts. The program tried to hire people with guest speaker contracts. There are 50 people who are ready to go and begin offering training but haven’t been formally hired. Nadia Cotti is working with HR to make this happen.
  - iv. **Next Steps:** DSA needs to approve some apparatus at the Del Valle Facility. The program is about 6 months away from the final inspection with the state fire marshall approval.

- v. **Changes to original conception for the Fire Academy.** There is now Fire Fighter 1 and 2 area. The changes have resulted in a need for different equipment and staffing. The program needs to work with the LA Country Fire Department to develop an agreement. There are fire academies at AV, Glendale and Allen Hancock that would be a good source to analyze for staffing needs. The idea of keeping both programs together is due to the same time stamp for fire fighter 1 and 2 and to explain to students what they can expect in terms of this career. There was a PT academy planned, and this was based on the availability of the training center. COC is not affected to run a Full-time academy as COC will be the only program in the area. The PT academy poses challenges to gather enough instructors as they need to keep every weekend for a year.
- vi. **Marketing** The idea is to start advertising soon via social media or the school's website although the word is out. The suggestion is to have Mark join the weekly Counseling program so that students are ready to enroll.
- vii. **Counseling:** Clinton Slaughter offered support to the Fire Academy. HART ROP and the outreach team will also be interested in learning more about the program and can help with student enrollment. Nadia and Mark will meet with Erin Tague regarding Facilities. DSA stated that there is one area at Del Valle that DSA can approve. There is a tower that can be used by looking at the cement. The first step is to have Erin look at the cement issue otherwise there is a prompt that would need to be purchased and have in place at the facility. The accreditation rep is aware of this and is working with the program.

### III. Discussion

1. Non-Credit (N.C.) Courses for individuals with Disabilities-COC Inclusive Learning Institute, Garrett Rieck:
  - i. **Program Overview:** The title of the program is still a working title. The purpose and goal of the program, not a program but a category of non-credit, to expand equitable access to education. There are classes for credit students, but there is an area missing in noncredit. There are 10 categories of noncredit.
  - ii. **Why is this needed?** Currently there is a wide variety of non-credit courses in every category except for students with disabilities. There is currently partnership with YIC and Agape Village.
  - iii. **New Curriculum Design:** The focus is on personal fulfillment and art. There is much success with the Accessible Watercolor classes. The focus is on the arts and adapted fitness. Pasadena City College is the model being considered.
  - iv. **Funding Sources:** There is funding with CAEP, and lottery funds left over. There is a mini grant that was received in 2024 to develop curriculum for students with disabilities. There is much fundraising that happens. Until the program is piloted for a year with 4 to 5 classes, it is hard to determine the exact budget.
  - v. **Physical Resources:** The PTA program has offered the use of space as well as the Canyon Country Community Center and Agape Village. This program will not look like other programs at other colleges as they have existing dedicated gym spaces. This program does not need a full gym as resistance bands can be utilized. There are existing facilities and West PE 105 is a great class for this program.
  - vi. **Human Resources:** PPL Dean, faculty and staff are eager to support the program. There may be a need for instructional aid. All CCC's seem to be making their own decision and use Vocational Noncredit as an option to meet MQ's. For the Art classes there is a faculty member who has DSPS and the Art qualification.
  - vii. **Alignment of Program:** This is to provide inclusive environment for those with disabilities. This aligns with the strategic plan and inclusiveness for credit career and professional development.
  - viii. **Implementation Timeline:** The timeline will include the development and approval, and the program launch (Pilot) to evaluate and grow to a full expansion. The program is prepared to launch on a small scale. Via the PV Report process.

- ix. **Vision for the program:** There is a need to hire an additional support person for this program in ACC. DSPS confirmed there is funding. CAPE funding allocations are old, and the hope is to get this updated. Hopefully by 26-28 this can be figured out.
  - x. **ACC funds to support salaries.** While Wil Francis has offered to help fund this program, many categorical programs in Student Services have prohibitions for instructional functions. The hope is to review and ensure there are no limitations.
  - xi. **Additional prompts to the Pro Forma for Non-Credit:** This will help to ascertain viability considerations for programs going forward. The committee is looking towards a two-read model for program initiation.
  - xii. **Next Steps:** The next step will be to vote on whether to move forward or not with the program pilot. The next meeting has been cancelled due to Lisa serving on the CEO hiring committee. The next meeting will be held on March 26<sup>th</sup>.
2. Possible refinements to the Program Viability and AP process, Lisa Hooper
- i. This item will return on the next meeting.

**IV. Adjournment:** 11:30 am.

**Revisions to existing Tenure Committees for 2025-26**

Last Name	First Name	School/Department	Committee Chair	Peer Evaluator	Administrator	FT Faculty Hire Date	Status
Mullins	Erica	Biology (Microbiology)	Kelly Cude	Julie Johnson	<b>David Vakil</b>	8/15/25	1st year
Hands	Loni	Biology (Microbiology)	Kelly Cude	Adina Carrillo	<b>Jennifer Brezina</b>	8/15/25	1st year
Partida	Bryant	Ethnic Studies Instructor (Chicano/o Studies)	<b>Jennifer Thompson</b>	Juan Buriel	Deanna Riveira	8/9/2024	2nd year

# **HUMAN RESOURCES OFFICE**

---

Date: February 25, 2026  
To: Alisha Kaminsky  
President, Academic Senate  
From: Teressa Soto  
Senior HR Generalist (Academic Personnel)  
Subject: Additional Discipline Assignment – Erica Seubert

---

Name: Erica Seubert  
Current Position on File: Biology  
Requested Discipline: Vocational (Short Term): Noncredit

---

The minimum qualifications for the discipline of Vocational (Short Term): Noncredit

- Possession of an unexpired California Community College Instructor Credential in the discipline **OR**
- Any bachelor's degree and two (2) years of occupational experience related to the subject of the course taught or the **equivalent, OR**
- Any associate degree and six (6) years of occupational experience related to the subject of the course taught or the **equivalent, OR**
- Possession of a full-time, clear California Designated Subjects Adult Education Teaching Credential authorizing instruction in the subject matter; **OR**
- For courses in an occupation for which the District offers or has offered apprenticeship instruction, the minimum qualifications for noncredit apprenticeship instructors in that occupation, as specified in title 5 section 53413.

---

Erica Seubert meets the minimum qualifications with:

- PhD in Biology from USC
- Over seven (7) years of occupational experience as a graduate research assistant and private tutor. Graduate Research Assistant – University of Southern California, Department of Biological Sciences (2007-2013), Project Specialist, Joint Education Project - University of Southern California (2014-2015), Private Tutor: Biology – Boston Education (2013-2014), Private Tutor: Biology, Algebra, Chemistry – Wyzant Tut (2010 – 2014), Lead Facilitator for Reading Apprenticeship – WestEd (Summer 2025), and Lead Facilitator for Reading Strategies – College of the Canyons (Summer 2025).

cc: Marilyn Jimenez

Santa Clarita Community College District  
COLLEGE OF THE CANYONS



**CETL Steering Committee  
Recommendations on Course Syllabi  
Report: Guiding Principles in Designing a Syllabus**

**CETL Syllabi Sub Committee:**

Victoria Leonard

Julie Johnson

Robert Wonser

**Prepared for  
College of the Canyons Academic Senate  
Spring 2026**

# Introduction

A well-designed syllabus is more than just an administrative document; it is also a foundational tool for student success. A *learner centered* syllabus prioritizes clarity, accessibility, and engagement, and can help students navigate course expectations effectively. A structured, yet flexible, approach to a syllabus enhances both student learning and instructor autonomy. This paper suggests specific elements that are strongly recommended to create an effective and equitable learning environment.

Throughout these recommendations, you will find:

-  Suggested syllabi elements
-  Practical syllabi examples
-  A quick Reference Recommendations Table

---

## Learner Centered Syllabus Elements and Rationale

 **Basic Course Information (Campus, Title, Number, Section, Instructor details, Office hours and Meeting Times, Instructor Contact Information, Modality).**

***Rationale:*** Ensuring students have clear access to logistical details fosters organization and preparedness. Assists with any future need to find the syllabus for a transfer institution.

***Student Benefit:*** Provides essential information upfront, reducing confusion.

***Supporting Evidence:*** Williams (2018) describes the syllabus as a “road map for success,” reinforcing the idea that basic course details are crucial for student navigation.

### Examples

#### **College of the Canyons**

**Course Title:** COMM 246 – *Interpersonal Communication*

**Section:** XXXXX – Fall 2025 *In this course, we’ll explore how people connect, build relationships, and navigate real-life communication challenges — skills that benefit both your personal and professional life.*

**Instructor:** Name, Title, Department, School of XXXX

**Office Location:** Hasley Hall XXX (and online via Zoom)

**Office Hours:** Tuesdays 11:00–12:00 p.m. (in person) and Wednesdays 10:00–11:00 a.m. (Zoom) — or by appointment.

**Contact:** Name@[canyons.edu](mailto:Name@canyons.edu)

**Phone:** (661) 362-XXXX (voicemail available)

**Preferred Contact and Getting Your Questions Answered:** *Office hours are your time — come by to ask questions, talk about class topics, or check in about your progress. I check email daily, Monday through Friday from 8:00 am through 7:00 pm.*

## [Catalog Description, Course Description, and Student Learning Outcomes](#)

**Rationale:** A course description and objectives with clearly defined student learning outcomes help students align their expectations with course goals. This information is also relied upon when transfer institutions are looking at a syllabus to determine whether the course will articulate with their university.

**Student Benefit:** Encourages self-directed learning by clarifying what skills and knowledge they will gain.

**Supporting Evidence:** Bart (2017) emphasizes that “a syllabus that is transparent about expectations helps students take ownership of their learning.”

## **Examples**

**Catalog Description** (from the COC Catalog): *Introduction to the principles and processes of interpersonal communication with emphasis on perception, self-concept, listening, verbal and nonverbal communication, and relational dynamics. Application of theory to enhance communication competence in personal and professional contexts.*

**Course Description (in Syllabus):** Welcome to *Interpersonal Communication!* In this course, you’ll learn how communication shapes every relationship you have — from friendships and family to work teams and social interactions. Together, we’ll explore how perception, emotions, language, and listening affect understanding and connection. You’ll also gain strategies to handle conflict, build empathy, and strengthen your confidence as a communicator in any setting.

**Student Learning Outcomes** (What You’ll Be Able to Do): By the end of the semester, you will be able to: Recognize how your own communication choices influence understanding and connection with others. Use foundational concepts and models of interpersonal communication to interpret real-life interactions. Apply active listening and conflict-resolution strategies to improve personal and professional relationships.

## [Grading Policy and Assessment Breakdown](#)

**Rationale:** Transparency in grading prevents misunderstandings and grade disputes. Including percentages and weight of assignments, explanations of how grades will be calculated, and the inclusion of extra credit will help students track their grades.

**Student Benefit:** Reduces anxiety by offering a clear roadmap for academic performance.

**Supporting Evidence:** The American Psychological Association (2019) states that “grading transparency is essential for fostering a sense of fairness in the classroom.” Research indicates that transparent policies

emphasizing *communication and shared responsibility* can enhance student motivation and self-regulation (Nilson & Goodson, 2018). When flexibility or grace periods are given, and the instructor communicates these expectations clearly, student anxiety will be reduced and instructors show that they understand that our students may have complex lives outside of the classroom. “When students perceive their instructor as fair and supportive, they are more likely to persist and engage meaningfully with coursework” (Felten et al., 2019).

## Examples

**Grading Philosophy:** Grades in this course reflect your learning progress, effort, and engagement with the material. My goal is to give you multiple ways to demonstrate what you’ve learned through written, spoken, and creative work. *Communication is a skill, not a one-time performance, so you’ll receive feedback designed to help you grow over time.*

### **Assessment Breakdown:**

**Learning Activities (35%)** – Small assignments, discussions, and reflections that help you practice core skills before larger projects. All of these will be provided both in Canvas and in a handout form for you.

**Major Projects (40%)** – Includes your interpersonal observation report and applied communication analysis. Rubrics are provided so you know exactly what success looks like before you start.

**Participation & Collaboration (15%)** – Based on meaningful contributions to discussions, group work, and peer support. All points for participation will be based on activities completed when you attend class.

**Final Reflection (10%)** – A personal synthesis essay on what you’ve learned about yourself as a communicator.

**Grading Scale:** A = 90–100% B = 80–89% C = 70–79% D = 60–69% F = below 60%

## Course Policies - COC Attendance Policy, Participation, Late Work, and Academic Integrity

[COC Attendance Policy BP/AP 5070](#)

**Rationale:** Standardized policies ensure consistency and fairness.

**Student Benefit:** Helps students make informed decisions regarding their coursework.

**Supporting Evidence:** The Northern Illinois University Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (2020) argues that “explicit policies provide a safety net for students navigating college expectations.”

## Participation and Engagement

**Rationale:** Participation fosters active learning, deeper comprehension, and accountability. By making it an observable, graded component, students are encouraged to engage meaningfully, develop communication skills, and contribute to an *inclusive learning environment*.

***Student Benefit:*** Enhances Learning: Active participation improves retention and understanding (Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, 2022). Builds Confidence: Encourages students to develop academic discourse skills (Bart, 2017). Promotes Equity: Ensures all students have structured opportunities to contribute (Eslami et al., 2024). Develops Professional Skills: Strengthens communication and collaboration abilities (APA, 2019).

***Supporting Evidence:*** Participation creates an active learning environment where students feel connected (APA, 2019). Structured participation reduces inequities in STEM classrooms (Eslami et al., 2024). Clear participation policies increase engagement and course satisfaction (CITL, 2022). Outlining participation expectations sets the tone for meaningful interactions (Bart, 2017). Explanations of participation lead to fewer grade disputes (Leonard, 2002).

## Examples

**Attendance & Participation Policy:** Because communication is learned through interaction, your consistent participation matters; not just for your grade, but for your learning and the community we create together. We all come from different backgrounds and experiences, and sharing your views helps contribute to the learning environment we create together.

**What Counts as Attendance:** Attending class regularly and not missing more than 10% of the length of the class. If you do not attend three class sessions, you will be dropped on the fourth absence per the college's policy unless there are compelling personal reasons that prevented you from being in class. *Only extreme circumstances may be considered since you need to fulfill the state requirements for student contact hours.*

**What Counts as Participation:** Being present in class, contributing to discussions, completing Face-to-Face or Canvas activities, and staying engaged in group work. Remember: All activities have a point value!

**If You Need to Miss Class:** Life happens — illness, family emergencies, and work conflicts can occur. Please communicate with me as soon as possible so we can discuss options for staying on track.

**Non-Participation/Drop Policy:** If you stop attending or submitting work for two consecutive weeks without contact, I will reach out to check in. If there's no response after reasonable attempts, I may have to drop you from the course in accordance with the college's policy. The goal is not to penalize you but to prevent you from academic harm on your transcript. Staying in touch with me keeps your options open for success or withdrawal without penalty!

**Late & Revision Policy:** Communication about deadlines is encouraged. If you need more time, contact me *before the due date* so we can plan a solution. Some assignments allow revision after feedback; those opportunities will be clearly marked on Canvas. *Learning is a process, and flexibility helps everyone stay on track.*

## ➔ Required Materials and Resources (Textbooks, ISBN Numbers, OER, Additional items that will be purchased).

**Rationale:** Ensures students have the tools they need for success.

**Student Benefit:** Helps with financial planning and preparation.

**Supporting Evidence:** Eslami et al. (2024) found that access to clear resource lists reduced equity gaps in STEM education.

## Examples

**Recommended Materials:** A notebook or digital tool for reflective journaling and class notes. *If you prefer to take notes digitally, you may use a laptop or tablet during discussions — just stay engaged and present with your peers.*

## □ Recommended Humanized Syllabi Elements

### ➔ Campus Support Services (Tutoring, Academic Accommodations, Mental Health Resources, Veterans Services, Basic Needs Center, etc.)

**Rationale:** Promotes student well-being and success.

**Student Benefit:** Increases awareness of support structures, especially for first-generation students.

**Supporting Evidence:** CSUN Teaching Toolkit (n.d.) states that “embedding student resources in the syllabus normalizes help-seeking behavior.”

## Detailed Weekly/Monthly Schedule (Calendar can be a separate document)

**Rationale:** Helpful and can be adjusted in real-time so there is flexibility for the instructor.

**Student Benefit:** Provides a roadmap for students so they can plan their schedules regarding both their school and work schedules.

**Supporting Evidence:** As the University of Michigan's Center for Research on Learning and Teaching advises, "Make sure to bold, underline, or highlight significant due dates for papers, projects, or lab reports... and dates of exams, quizzes, or finals" (2025). Stanford Teaching Commons notes that by "clearly organizing your syllabus to communicate the course schedule, assignments, and policies, you can enable students to better manage their time and be successful in your course" (2025).

## → Optional Elements

### **Student Success Tips and Study Strategies**

*Rationale:* Encourages academic skills development.

*Student Benefit:* Especially useful for students new to college-level learning.

### **Instructor’s Biography, Teaching Philosophy and Course Approach**

*Rationale:* Builds rapport and sets a positive tone for learning.

*Student Benefit:* Humanizes the instructor and fosters engagement.

## Addressing Academic Freedom Concerns

The proposed suggestions do not impede academic freedom; rather, they ensure that all students receive a baseline level of clarity and support. As Sinor and Kaplan (n.d.) note, “the syllabus is a contract that ensures consistency while allowing for pedagogical creativity.” Faculty maintain the ability to shape course content and teaching style while adhering to institutional standards that benefit students.

Instructors retain full autonomy over **how** participation is structured and assessed, ensuring transparency while maintaining flexibility in andrological approaches.

## Syllabus Accessibility and Storage

Access to the syllabus is a final consideration that CETL has explored. The value of having a syllabus in Canvas allows students to access it digitally and allows the instructor to make updates to due dates when necessary. *Once Canvas is no longer accessible to students, it is important for the College and specific department to have a digitized copy so that any future questions of articulation can be easily addressed and answered.*

## Conclusion

Feel free to remix, reuse, and adapt any of this and make it your own. These guiding principles balance structure with flexibility, ensuring students have the necessary tools to succeed while allowing instructors to maintain their teaching philosophy, while creating inclusive and transparent learning environments without compromising academic freedom.

## References

**American Psychological Association.** (2019, October). *Tips for designing a skills-based, learner-centered syllabus that engages students.* *Psychology Teacher Network.*

<https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/ptn/2019/10/skills-learner-centered-syllabus>

**Bart, M.** (2017, June 24). *A learner-centered syllabus helps set the tone for learning.*

Faculty Focus | Higher Ed Teaching & Learning. <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/effective-classroom-management/a-learner-centered-syllabus-helps-set-the-tone-for-learning/>

**Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning.** (2022, August 15). *Creating a learner-centered syllabus*. CITL Newsletter. <https://citl.news.niu.edu/2022/08/15/creating-a-learner-centered-syllabus/>

**Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.** (n.d.). *Creating your syllabus*. University of Michigan. Retrieved March 22, 2025, from [https://crlt.umich.edu/gsis/p2\\_1](https://crlt.umich.edu/gsis/p2_1)  
**CSUN Teaching Toolkit.** (n.d.). *Design a learning-centered syllabus*. California State University, Northridge. <https://www.csun.edu/undergraduate-studies/faculty-development/design-learning-centered-syllabus>

Eslami, M., Denaro, K., Collins, P., Sumarsono, J. M., Dennin, M., & Sato, B. (2024). *How syllabi relate to outcomes in higher education: A study of syllabi learner-centeredness and grade inequities in STEM*. *PLOS ONE*, 19(4), e0301331. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0301331>

Felten, P., Gardner, J. N., Schroeder, C. C., Lambert, L. M., & Barefoot, B. O. (2019). *The undergraduate experience: Focusing institutions on what matters most*. Jossey-Bass.

Leonard, V. (2002). *Designing an effective course syllabus: Course syllabi for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Faculty website developed for College of the Canyons.

Nilson, L. B., & Goodson, L. A. (2018). *Online teaching at its best: Merging instructional design with teaching and learning research* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

**Northern Illinois University Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning.** (2020). *Creating a course syllabus. Instructional guide for university faculty and teaching assistants*. Northern Illinois University. <https://www.niu.edu/citl/resources/guides/instructional-guide>

**Sacramento City College.** (n.d.). *Syllabi*. Inside SCC. <https://inside.scc.losrios.edu/faculty/faculty-how-to/preparing-to-teach/syllabi>

Sinor, J., & Kaplan, M. (n.d.). *Creating your syllabus*. Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. [https://crlt.umich.edu/gsis/p2\\_1](https://crlt.umich.edu/gsis/p2_1)

Stanford Teaching Commons. (n.d.). *Optimizing your syllabus*. Stanford University. Retrieved March 22, 2025, from <https://teachingcommons.stanford.edu/teaching-guides/foundations-course-design/course-planning/optimizing-syllabus>

**UCLA.** (n.d.). *UCLA course approval manual*. <https://apb.ucla.edu/file/ee262ed6-7693-42b9-8744-04c14284cab8>

**UC Merced.** (n.d.). *Guide to building your syllabus*. Teaching Commons. <https://teach.ucmerced.edu/syllabus>

**University of California, Berkeley.** (n.d.). *Syllabus design*. Teaching Guides. <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/teaching-guides/designing-your-course/syllabus-design>

**Williams, E. A.** (2018, October 23). *A road map for success: The importance of the course syllabus for first-year students*. Higher Ed360. <https://www.highered360.com/articles/articleDisplay.cfm?ID=1753>

## Syllabus Elements Quick Reference Table

Syllabus Element	Rationale	Example
<b>Basic Course Information</b>	Ensures students have clear access to logistical details; fosters organization and preparedness; assists with future transfer institution needs.	Course Title: Instructor: Name, Title, Department Office Hours: Contact: Name@canyons.edu
<b>Catalog Description, Course Description &amp; Learning Outcomes</b>	Helps students align expectations with course goals; encourages self-directed learning by clarifying skills and knowledge they will gain; required for transfer articulation.	Course Description Learning Outcomes
<b>Grading Policy &amp; Assessment Breakdown</b>	Transparency in grading prevents misunderstandings and grade disputes; reduces anxiety by offering a clear roadmap for academic performance.	Assessment Breakdown Grading Scale
<b>Attendance Policy</b>	Standardized policies ensure consistency and fairness; helps students make informed decisions regarding their coursework.	What Counts as Attendance
<b>Participation &amp; Engagement</b>	Fosters active learning, deeper comprehension, and accountability; encourages meaningful engagement and inclusive learning environment.	What Counts as Participation
<b>Late Work &amp; Revision Policy</b>	Clear communication about deadlines reduces student anxiety; flexibility demonstrates understanding that students have complex lives outside the classroom.	Deadlines
<b>Academic Integrity</b>	Ensures consistency and fairness; provides a safety net for students navigating college expectations.	<i>Follow COC policies on academic integrity</i>
<b>Required Materials &amp; Resources</b>	Ensures students have the tools they need for success; helps with financial planning and preparation.	Texts Recommended Materials
<b>Campus Support Services</b>	Promotes student well-being and success; increases awareness of support structures, especially for first-generation students; normalizes help-seeking behavior.	<i>Include links to: Tutoring, Academic Accommodations, Mental Health Resources, Veterans Services, Basic Needs Center</i>
<b>Detailed Schedule</b>	Provides a roadmap for students to plan their schedules regarding both school and work; can be adjusted in real-time for instructor flexibility.	<i>Weekly/monthly calendar with highlighted due dates for major assignments, exams, and projects</i>

## Spring 2026 Report for Academic Senate – Full Time Faculty Evaluation Tool – A History

### A 4.5 Year Process of Evaluation Reform and DEIA Integration

Prepared for the Academic Senate Spring 2026 by Julianne Johnson, Robert Wonser, and Alene Terzian-Zeitounian

#### Timeline of Faculty Participants

“OG” Joint Task Force 2021-2023	DEIA Competencies Task Force 2023-2024	Combined Task Force 2024-2025
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Andrus, Academic Senate</li> <li>• Regina Blasberg, Academic Senate, Ed Tech, CTE</li> <li>• Jason Burgdorfer, COCFA</li> <li>• Kelly Burke, COCFA, CETL</li> <li>• Katie Coleman, CETL IOI, EMP</li> <li>• Rebecca Eikley, COCFA, Faculty Evaluation Sabbatical Project</li> <li>• Nicole Faudree, COCFA</li> <li>• Julie Johnson, CETL, EMP, Ed Tech</li> <li>• Andrew Jones-Cathcart, Ed Tech</li> <li>• Michelle LaBrie, CETL IOI, EMP, Ed Tech</li> <li>• Deanna Riveira, COCFA</li> <li>• Robert Wonser, CETL, EMP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Andrus, Academic Senate</li> <li>• Julie Johnson, CETL, EMP, Ed Tech</li> <li>• Robert Wonser, CETL, EMP</li> <li>• Alene Terzian-Zeitounian, IDEAA Faculty Liaison, EMP</li> <li>• Gary Colis, Academic Senate</li> <li>• Gary Quire, CTE</li> <li>• Garrett Hooper, COCFA</li> <li>• Chris Blakey, Academic Freedom</li> <li>• Tricia George, Curriculum Chair</li> <li>• Katie Coleman, CETL IOI, EMP</li> <li>• Jennifer Thompson, EMP</li> <li>• Anthony Clayton, Adjunct</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Julie Johnson, CETL, EMP, Ed Tech</li> <li>• Robert Wonser, CETL, EMP</li> <li>• Alene Terzian-Zeitounian, IDEAA Faculty Liaison, EMP</li> <li>• Lisa Hooper, Academic Senate President</li> <li>• Regina Blasberg, Academic Senate, Ed Tech, CTE</li> <li>• Gary Quire, CTE</li> <li>• Garrett Hooper, COCFA</li> <li>• Katie Coleman, CETL IOI, EMP</li> <li>• Jennifer Thompson, EMP</li> <li>• Jason Burgdorfer, COCFA</li> <li>• Ruth Rassool, Adjunct</li> </ul>

### Full Timeline (Fall 2021– Spring 2025)

Over the past 4.5 years, College of the Canyons full time faculty have engaged in a sustained and collaborative effort to revise our Full-Time Faculty evaluation tools. What began as a local initiative, evolved into a complex integration of statewide DEIA mandates, faculty governance

deliberations, and institutional reflection on teaching, inclusivity, and academic freedom. The work was at times rewarding, cumbersome, deliberate, iterative, and often challenging. The collegial discussions reflected both the seriousness of the task and the diversity of perspectives across campus.

## Phase I: Local Evaluation Reform and Tenure Process (Fall 2021 – 2022)

### Fall 2021

A Joint Task Force between COCFA and the Academic Senate was formed to update the Full-Time Faculty evaluation tool and examine the overall Tenure Process. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) was included in the process for a pedagogical perspective. This original working group, the “OG Task Force” focused on improving clarity, coherence, and alignment within the evaluation instrument and the tenure process as a whole.

After much deliberation, faculty decided the tenure process needed massive overhaul but was way beyond the scope of our task force, so we focused on updating the evaluation tool itself.

At the same time, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office released statewide [DEIA Competencies and Criteria November 2021](#), and [Responses to Public Comments](#) about integrating DEIA into evaluations, all of which introduced a new layer of considerations that would later intersect with our local work.

### March 2022

The Evaluations Task Force developed a working timeline structured around backward design principles. The group committed to:

- Creating a working timeline of expectations and due dates
- Articulating a “30,000-foot” vision for the tenure process
- Mapping the actual procedural timeline
- Developing evaluation training through CETL (OG target: Fall 2023)

The ethos of this stage was collaborative and developmental: “All ideas welcome. All suggestions editable.” We wanted to bring larger groups of faculty together on campus to discuss and engage with our process.

Robert and Julie, as CETL faculty leads, assumed facilitation roles for the evaluation discussions, continuing the collaborative framework. Within this Evaluation Tool draft, there was a whole section dedicated to DEIA work. **This was “Section F.”**

## May 2022

David presented an [Academic Tenure Philosophy Statement](#).

The evaluation documents were being developed by the joint task force, and we hoped to go to COCFA for consideration during the bargaining process. The committee acknowledged that teaching was essential and that many faculty members were outstanding instructors. At the same time, we emphasized that participation in the collegial shared governance process should also be recognized as an important part of the tenure process. The evaluation documents were always expected to be revised to reflect this priority.

To inform the campus community of our progress, a Faculty Flex Session was held on August 16, 2022, from 12:45 - 2:30. David Andrus, Regina Blasberg, Jason Burgdorfer, Katie Coleman, Rebecca Eikey, Julie Johnson, Andrew Jones-Cathcart, Michelle LaBrie and Robert Wonsler attended as presenters.

## Phase II: State Mandate and Competency Integration (2023 – Spring 2024)

A [report was submitted to Academic Senate](#) in Spring 2023 that included the original Section F and explanation of the OG Task Force process. (pages 21-28)

Also in 2023, Title 5 regulatory updates required districts to integrate [DEIA competencies into employee evaluation processes](#).

A second working group, led by Academic Senate President, David Andrus, was convened to take the OG document and incorporate these [competencies](#) into the existing evaluation revision work.

### Fall 2023 – Spring 2024

David led extended discussions on competency definitions and integration strategies. The work became increasingly complex, as faculty wrestled with questions of academic freedom, criteria alignment, and implementation.

The DEIA task force meetings addressed:

- Competing CCCCO definitions of Cultural Competency
- The Title 5 definition of “Criteria”
- Whether to adopt the [Chancellor’s Office competencies](#) “as is” or define them locally
- The need to align six competencies with seven evaluation criteria categories

The six competencies under consideration included:

- Cultural Competency
- Professional Self-Reflection
- Professional Self-Improvement
- DEIA Pedagogy and Curriculum
- Data
- DEIA and Mission

Corresponding evaluation criteria included:

- Service
- **Self-Assessment**
- DEIA Environment
- Pedagogy/Curriculum
- Professional Development
- Connected to Mission
- Employee Interactions

Many suggestions for integration were introduced. An alignment table was introduced as a starting framework for categorically mapping competencies to our local evaluation tool, “Section F.” This document was referred to as the “skittles” document. (Addendum I - DEIA Alignment discussions for Section F – the “Skittles Document”)

Key tensions emerged:

- State mandates for adoption vs. local adaptation
- Developmental growth vs. evaluative measurement
- Broad competency language vs. specific DEIA definitions
- State mandate vs. district policy infrastructure

## Phase III: Consolidation and Senate Deliberation (2024–May 2025)

By 2024, the "OG" evaluation group and the DEIA integration group were combined to unify the process.

**Upon direction from campus leaders, and considering ASCCC discussions and statewide legal concerns, it was decided to remove Section F completely from the new evaluation tool and instead include relevant, research driven, student-centered pedagogy throughout the evaluation document. It was further decided to include DEIA language in the Self Reflection Tool to align with state mandates and criteria.**

The resulting documents included:

- A revised Full-Time Faculty Evaluation Tool without Section F
- A redesigned Self-Reflection instrument with DEIA competencies per the chancellor's office

The revised tools were framed as student-centered, growth-oriented, and supportive of academic freedom, *with no specific reference to DEIA*.

The entire integrated group worked to include references to DEIA into the Self Reflection Tool.

### **Senate Discussion: May 2025**

In May 2025, the combined Task Force presented a new draft of the Evaluation Tool and Self Evaluation Recommendations to the Academic Senate. (pages 42-47)

The Academic Senate engaged in substantive discussion of the proposed revisions. The conversation reflected both support for the four-year effort and concern about implementation details.

### **Major Themes Raised**

#### **1. Operational Definitions**

Multiple senators asked who defines terms such as “student-centered pedagogy” and “culturally affirming pedagogy.” Calls were made for a glossary to prevent subjective interpretation and inconsistent application.

#### **2. Scoring Clarity**

Questions arose regarding distinctions between performance levels (e.g., what differentiates a “3” from a “4”). Some perceived the scoring rubric as setting a high bar without clear benchmarks.

#### **3. Scope of DEIA Integration**

Several senators observed that DEIA language was heavily infused in certain sections, particularly in the self-reflection tool. While many supported inclusion, some suggested balancing DEIA examples with broader pedagogical examples to ensure durability and flexibility.

#### **4. Governance and Compliance Concerns**

It was noted that Title 5 regulations contemplate district-level board policy adoption, evaluator training, and comprehensive infrastructure. Concerns were raised that the district may not yet have implemented the full policy framework necessary to support evaluation changes.

## **5. Implementation Culture**

There was discussion about the importance of training, phased rollout, and avoiding a checklist mentality. Some warned that highly detailed sample indicators could feel confining rather than developmental.

## **6. Adjunct Evaluation Alignment**

Questions were raised about language clarity and consistency between full-time and adjunct evaluation documents.

## **2026 Summary**

This work has not been linear. It has required merging many parallel efforts, including evaluation reform, DEIA integration, union concerns, and state mandates, into a coherent framework. Over the last 4.5 years, many discussions revealed concern for equity-minded training, academic freedom, fairness, due process, and institutional readiness. It is also important to note that the campus has engaged in extensive DEIA training and programming over the past several years, including initiatives such as ICC programming, CETL courses, Equity Minded Practitioners offerings, OFAR – Open for Antiracism, Antiracism Speaker Series, Teach-Ins with Artivism, Alliance workshops, Sandbox training, the IDEAA Repository, IDEAAShare workshops, Sagely, and the Joy Cooperative, among many others.

Across all iterations of the task force work, the guiding mission was to place student achievement and faculty professional growth above all other considerations, consistent with the [Academic Senate Tenure Philosophy Statement](#) and grounded in historic and current pedagogical scholarship.

## Addendum

### I. DEIA Alignment discussions for Section F – the “Skittles Document”

Competency	Criteria
<b>Cultural</b> Competency	Service (e.g., service to the institution or community, or professional service)
Self-reflection	Self-assessment
Self-improvement	Diversity, Equity and <b>Inclusion</b> Environment
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion <b>Pedagogy</b> & Curriculum	<b>Pedagogy</b> /Curriculum
Data	Professional Development
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion & <b>Mission</b>	Connected to <b>Mission</b>
	<b>Employee</b> Interactions

#### F. Equity and Inclusion

Sample Indicators for 3 “Meets Standard” - Instructor demonstrates a consistent awareness and recognition of racial, gender, social, and **cultural** identities. Instructor acknowledges that **cultural** and social identities are diverse, fluid, and intersectional. Instructor demonstrates an understanding of the lived experiences of culturally diverse students, and communities in the **District**; and uses that understanding to contribute to student success, equity, and **inclusion**. Instructor pursues Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Access, and Anti-racism (IDEAA) perspectives and applies knowledge to problem-solving, policies, and processes to create respectful, IDEAA-affirming environments (e.g., **campus** and classroom **environments** that are inclusive, promote equity, and affirms diversity). The instructor creates **learning** experiences for diverse backgrounds and narratives.

**COLLEGE OF THE CANYONS**  
**Full Time Faculty Professional and Instructional Evaluation Summary**

Fall \_\_\_\_\_ Spring \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Modality: Online Drop Down Menu

If mixed modality (i.e. OnlineLive or Hybrid) indicate modality observed \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Please rate and evaluate the faculty using the following rubric. For each rubric item please include specific evidence and details to support each rating. If there is any *room for improvement, please discuss with the faculty member as a part of the evaluation process.*

Rating	Definition
5	<b>OUTSTANDING:</b> Evaluator observed exceptional performance.
4	<b>EXCEEDS STANDARD:</b> Evaluator observed performance that exceeds the standard.
3	<b>MEETS STANDARD:</b> Evaluator observed evidence of standard. Room for growth may exist.
2	<b>DEVELOPING:</b> Evaluator observed marginal evidence of standard. Room for growth exists. (Remediation Plan for tenure-track only)
1	<b>BELOW STANDARD:</b> Evaluator observed minimal evidence of standard. Considerable room for growth exists. (Remediation Plan for tenure-track only)
0	<b>No evidence of standard:</b> Evaluator observed no evidence of standard. (Remediation Plan for tenure-track only)

**A. Teaching Performance**

**1. Scholarship/Knowledge of Subject Matter**

*Sample Indicators for 3 "Meets Standard" - Highlights fundamental concepts of the subject. Engages students in discipline-specific thinking/expression. Instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter through a command of information, an ability to interpret information, and an ability to answer questions and reformulate*

explanations. Includes, when appropriate to the subject matter, the presentation of alternative and historically excluded viewpoints or theories.

3. Meets Standard

Comments/Evidence:

2. Clear and Measurable Lesson Objective(s)

Sample Indicators for 3 "Meets Standard" - Objectives address important concepts, skills to be learned, and are reflective of the Course Outline of Record. Lesson objectives are appropriate to the course and student needs. Objectives are accessible and/or regularly communicated to students.

3. Meets Standard

Comments:

3. Written and Oral Communications

Sample Indicators for 3 "Meets Standard" - Instructor models clear, professional, and appropriate language in all media used. Supportive and inclusive language is included in the syllabus and throughout the course. Instructor voice is present and primary throughout the course. Any publisher or third-party materials are used to complement instructor communication and expertise and adhere to accessibility standards. Instructions, interactions, and feedback are accurate, timely, easy to understand, and sufficiently specific and detailed in order to support a student-centered learning environment.

5. Outstanding

Comments:

4. Organization, Presentation, and Pacing of Activities

Sample Indicators for 3 "Meets Standard" - Attainment of the learning objectives are supported by instructional materials and lesson organization given the resources available. Activities are well-balanced and designed to support student-centered pedagogy. Instructor scaffolds the learning experience and presents a clear sequence or progression with the material/activities. Delivers a comprehensive recap of the lesson that reinforces and supports student learning. Lesson materials are presented at an appropriate rate and pace for student mastery of identified learning objectives.

0. Standard not Observed

Comments:

5. *Variety of Instructional Methods*

*Sample Indicators for 3 "Meets Standard" - Instructor uses teaching method(s) appropriate for the subject and modality, with attention to accessibility and the diverse learning styles of all students. Designs instruction with a myriad of learning styles in mind and presents opportunities for students to represent or express ideas. Instructor uses appropriate technology and media to support the course, such as the learning management system. Instructor engages available technology to design inclusive, student-centered learning activities. Uses a variety of means/tools to provide an interactive learning environment in the on-ground or online classroom. Students are provided with opportunities to practice and demonstrate skills, analysis, and critical thinking. Students are actively engaged as members of a learning community.*

1. Below Standard

Comments:

6. *Variety of Assessment Methods*

*Sample Indicators for 3 "Meets Standard" - Instructor has a clear assessment plan and divides their course into meaningful learning units. Includes clear and measurable student learning outcomes and provides a sufficient number and variety (e.g. exams, quizzes, written assignments, projects, readings) of methods to assess learning. Assessments are related to the stated course objectives and are supported by relevant course content, activities, and/or modalities. Assessments are appropriate to the specific course at hand and require critical thinking or disciplinary ways of thinking. For formative assessments, instructor provides constructive, sufficient, and detailed feedback designed to support student learning. (For F2F and OnlineLIVE) Instructor checks for understanding during class session.*

2. Developing

Comments:

---

*Evaluation of Additional Criteria:*

• **Collegiality and Institutional Service (Required for Full Time Faculty)**

Sample Indicators - Instructor is actively participating in campus duties outside the classroom per Article 12, Section A.2 of the COCFA contract. Examples may include, but are not limited to, Clubs, Committees, Academic Senate, Collaborative Projects with Colleagues, Student Engagement, Dept Contributions, Community Outreach, Advisory Groups. Commitment to continuing Professional Development. Instructor seeks out opportunities for self-improvement and reflects on student feedback. Instructor continues to grow and learn through professional development in holistic assessment methods and culturally affirming pedagogy.

**Comments:**

*Total Criteria Rating:* \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of  
Evaluator**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of  
Evaluatee**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** Evaluatee's signature does not necessarily imply agreement. It is merely an acknowledgment that the complete report has been read. Evaluatee may submit a written reaction within ten working days of receipt of this evaluation report. The written statement will be filed with this classroom visitation report.

# COLLEGE OF THE CANYONS

T	_____
NT	_____
Instructor	_____
Visitation Date	_____

Classroom Visitation Report

Course Number and Title \_\_\_\_\_  Lecture  Lab  Activity

Instructional Techniques Being Used

(lecture, discussion, audio/visual, laboratory, group activity, other)

Name of Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Circle the appropriate number for each item evaluated. Comments should detail specific items in support of your numerical assignment. If item is not applicable or you have no basis for judgment, circle N/A. May also include assessment of class materials and assessment instruments.

A. Knowledge of Subject matter  1  2  3  4  5  N/A 5

- Instructor demonstrates a broad knowledge of field
- 3 - Instructor demonstrates an adequate understanding of the subject
- 1 - Instructor does not appear to have an adequate background

Comments:

B. Clear Lesson Objectives  1  2  3  4  5  N/A

- 5 - Clearly defined objective/thorough preparation
- 3 - Some objectives not detected/evidence of some preparation
- 1 - No objectives for lesson evident/no evidence of prior preparation

Comments:

C. Clear Written and Oral Communications

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5 - Clear, enthusiastic, well-poised and direct; excellent vocabulary  
3 - Generally clear and understandable, good vocabulary and voice  
1 - Inaudible or illegible, lacks enthusiasm

Comments:

D. Variety of Teaching Methods

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5 - Uses a variety of teaching methods  
3 - Uses primarily one method (lecture, etc.)  
1 - Appears to be reading (rehashing) textbook

Comments:

E. Organization of Presentation and Activities

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5 - Clearly organized and easy-to-follow patterns  
3 - Discernible organizational pattern  
1 - Apparent lack of organization

Comments:

F. Good Time Management

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5 – Time is managed well

3 – Some parts of lesson go beyond time allocated or necessary 1 –

No apparent awareness of time and poor use of time

Comments:

G. Use of Appropriate Assessment Methods

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

(Suggestion: Request, if appropriate, a quiz or test before the classroom visitation.)

5 – Methods of assessment are appropriate

3 – Some methods do not seem to correspond with objectives 1 –

No correlation between assessment and objectives

Comments:

---

*Evaluation of Additional Criteria:*

Please include comments, if appropriate, concerning respect for students, respect for colleagues, professional growth, and department/college responsibilities. Attach additional pages if needed.

Signature of Evaluator

---

Signature of Evaluatee

---

**Note:** Evaluatee's signature does not necessarily imply agreement. It is merely an acknowledgment that the complete report has been read. Evaluatee may submit a written reaction within ten working days of receipt of this evaluation report. The written statement will be filed with this classroom visitation report.

# COLLEGE OF THE CANYONS

## Online/Hybrid Visitation Report

Use this form if the class to be evaluated takes place 100% online or hybrid class is 50% or more online.

<b>T</b>	_____
<b>NT</b>	_____
<b>Instructor</b>	_____
<b>Visitation Date</b>	_____

Course Number and Title \_\_\_\_\_  Lecture  Lab  Activity

Instructional Techniques Being Used

(video lectures, other lecture materials, discussion boards, small group activities)

Name of Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

**Directions:** Circle the appropriate number for each item evaluated. Comments should detail specific items in support of your numerical assignment. If item is not applicable or you have no basis for judgment, circle N/A. May also include assessment of class materials and assessment instruments.

### Content – Items A through C

A. Knowledge of Subject Matter  1  2  3  4  5  N/A

- 5 – Instructor demonstrates a command of the material taught.
- 3 – Instructor demonstrates an understanding of the material taught.
- 1 – Instructor does not appear to have an adequate background for the material taught.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Clear Communication  1  2  3  4  5  N/A

- 5 – Instructor models clear and appropriate language and style in all media used and provides well-defined lesson objectives. Instructions, interaction, and feedback are accurate, easy to understand and sufficiently specific and detailed.
- 3 – Communication in one or more media used is of average quality and may contain some errors or lack of specificity. Lesson objectives are provided in general terms.
- 1 – Poor quality communication in one or more media used; language vague, unclear, or containing significant errors. No lesson objectives are provided.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Student Assessment Methods

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5 – Assessments are of sufficient quantity and variety to address differing learning styles and to determine mastery of student learning outcomes.

3 – Some methods of assessment are adequate to assess a variety of student learning styles and student learning outcomes.

1 – Assessments address only a single learning style and are insufficient to accurately measure student learning outcomes.

Comments:

*Distance Learning – Items D through G*

D. Teaching Methods

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5 – Uses teaching method(s) appropriate for the subject, inclusive of diversity of student learning styles, and accessible to all students.

3 – Uses limited but adequate teaching method(s) for the subject; some components are not accessible to all students.

1 – Uses teaching method(s) that are inadequate to address the variety of student learning styles or that do not support the content well; many course components are not accessible to all students.

Comments:

E. Regular and Effective Contact

1  2  3  4  5  N/A

5 – Regular and effective instructor-student and student-student contact as described in the course outline of record is demonstrated through multiple techniques. Students receive instructor feedback on questions and assignments in a timely way.

3 – Limited but adequate instructor-student and student-student contact as described in the course outline of record is incorporated into the course. Students generally receive instructor feedback in a timely way, but there may be occasional delays.

1 – Regular and effective instructor-student and student-student contact as described in the course outline of record is not demonstrated in the course and/or instructor feedback is not provided in a timely way.

Comments:

**F. Organization and Presentation of Activities**

1    2    3    4    5    N/A

5 – Course elements are clearly organized and easy to locate. All links function properly and dates are accurate for the term.

3 – Discernible organization of course elements, though some items may be initially unclear. There may be some minor errors in links or dates.

1 – Apparent lack of organization, course elements difficult to locate. May contain multiple broken links or incorrect dates.

Comments:

**G. Course Pacing**

1    2    3    4    5    N/A

5 – Course materials are presented at an appropriate pace, including timing of units and release of materials and assignments.

3 – Course units, materials, and assignments, are generally presented at a reasonable pace, but there may be some inconsistencies.

1 – Course materials and assignments are presented late or in an erratic manner that does not give students sufficient time to meet deadlines.

Comments:

---

*Evaluation of Additional Criteria:*

Please include comments, if appropriate, concerning respect for students, respect for colleagues, professional growth, and department/college responsibilities. Attach additional pages if needed.

Signature of Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Evaluatee \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** Evaluatee's signature does not necessarily imply agreement. It is merely an acknowledgment that the complete report has been read. Evaluatee may submit a written reaction within ten working days of receipt of this evaluation report. The written statement will be filed with this classroom visitation report.

## NEW GUIDE FOR SELF EVALUATION TENURED AND TENURE TRACK FACULTY DRAFT

As part of the evaluation process for full-time non-tenured and tenured faculty, the COCFA contract [Article 7.C.1.a and Article 8.A.4.a] states:

Each contract faculty member will prepare a written self-evaluation report and present copies to all committee members one week before the review conference. Reflection on the SLOs results/data in the self-evaluation will not be used or viewed in a negative manner. The report shall include, but may not be limited to:

- A.** Objectives for the continued improvement of instruction based on the relationship of instruction to the course objectives, Student Learning Outcomes, the tabulated scores of the student evaluations, student achievement, assessment data from SLOs or other means, and additional criteria the contract faculty member deems relevant to his/her current assignment.

For example:

- a. Reflect and respond to feedback from the students.
- b. Which student learning outcomes guide your course design, and how do they align with inclusive and culturally responsive teaching practices?
- c. How do you integrate diverse perspectives, voices, and materials into your curriculum to reflect the backgrounds and experiences of your students?
- d. How do you adapt your assessment methods to accommodate diverse student needs and strengths?
- e. Can you provide an example of how you have revised a course or teaching approach to improve equity and inclusion?

- B.** Participation in non-classroom related activities, which may include professional growth and FLEX activities, committee assignments, relevant community involvement, and/or student activities plus objectives for continued involvement in these areas.

For example:

- a. What professional growth activities are you involved in or have you completed that relate to department goals?
- b. Have you attended or presented at conferences or workshops, such as FLEX activities, taken course work or been involved in relevant community activities?
- c. How has your committee work, or institutional service informed your classroom practices?

- C.** A professional development plan including but not limited to FLEX activities that align with department goals. (Optional for Tenured Faculty)

For example:

- a. What activities are you involved in or have you completed that relate to department goals?
- b. What are your short and long-term goals for continuing to improve your culturally responsive and inclusive teaching practices?
- c. What support, resources, or institutional changes would help you further integrate IDEAA principles into your teaching? What support and resources will you actively seek out in the future?
- d. What professional development or training have you engaged in to enhance your understanding of anti-racism, equity, equity-mindedness, and/or equity as it relates to your field and the COC community? This might include, but is not limited to, the following:
  - Curriculum review related to anti-racism, decolonization, and equity
  - Participation in anti-racism and equity related workshops/institutes
  - Review of professional materials and best practices for equity in your field, and/or
  - Review of your student success data

- D.** To what extent have the objectives for the improvement, participation in professional development activities, relevant community involvement and committee assignments stated in the contract faculty member's last report (if applicable) been met.

For example:

- a. What have you accomplished since the last report (if applicable)?
- b. What are your future objectives for teaching improvement and/or meeting department goals?
- c. How will you approach meeting these new objectives?
- d. What is the timeline for accomplishing these new objectives?

## *Current Guide to Self Service Evaluation Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty*

### GUIDE FOR SELF EVALUATION TENURED AND TENURE TRACK FACULTY

As part of the evaluation process for full-time non-tenured and tenured faculty, the COCFA contract [Article 7.C.1.a and Article 8.A.4.a] states:

Each contract faculty member will prepare a written self-evaluation report and present copies to all committee members one week before the review conference. Reflection on the SLOs results/data in the self-evaluation will not be used or viewed in a negative manner. The report shall include, but may not be limited to:

1. Objectives for the continued improvement of instruction based on the relationship of instruction to the course objectives, Student Learning Outcomes, the tabulated scores of the student evaluations, student achievement, assessment data from SLOs or other means, and additional criteria the contract faculty member deems relevant to his/her current assignment.

For example:

- Reflect and respond to feedback from the students.
  - What teaching techniques have you used? What has been effective?
  - What can you change and improve?
  - Are there external barriers that affect the quality of your teaching?
  - What training, materials, resources, etc., would assist you?
2. Participation in non-classroom related activities, which may include professional growth and FLEX activities, committee assignments, relevant community involvement, and/or student activities plus objectives for continued involvement in these areas.

For example:

- What professional growth activities are you involved in or have you completed?
  - Have you attended or presented at conferences or workshops, such as FLEX activities, taken course work or been involved in relevant community activities?
  - Do you participate on committees?
  - How have these activities impacted your teaching?
3. A professional development plan including but not limited to FLEX activities that aligns with department goals. (Optional for Tenured Faculty)

For example:

- What activities are you involved in or have you completed that relate to department goals?
  - How have these activities impacted your role in your department and its goals?
4. To what extent the objectives for the improvement, participation in professional development activities, relevant community involvement and committee assignments stated in the contract faculty member's last report (if applicable) have been met.

For example:

- What have you accomplished since the last report (if applicable)?
- What are your future objectives for teaching improvement and/or meeting department goals?
- How will you approach meeting these new objectives?
- What is the time line for accomplishing these new objectives?