

**Shasta College
Academic Senate
Minutes
October 23, 2000
Board Room 3:05 PM**

Members Present:

Nick Rogers
Randy Reed
Jeff Cooper
Estella Cox
Sandy Johnson
Carolyn Borg
Dave Bush
Lew Schmitt
Cathy Anderson
Sue Hess
Ron Marley
Warren Lytle
Sharon Yox
Frank Nigro
Dan Scollon
Richard Saunders
John Cicero
Philip Roche
Chuck Spotts

Guests Present:

Joe Adams
Angela Brock
Nata Greenleaf
Sue Anthis
Ken Kilborn
Mark Bongay

1. Call To Order

2. Approval of Previous Minutes

--Minutes for Sept. 23 approved (Warren Lytle made the motion, Dave Bush seconded it); Minutes for Oct. 9 approved (Dave made the motion, Sandy Johnson seconded it). All voted unanimously in favor for both sets of minutes.

3. Guests-

a. Victoria Hindes- Director of Grants, James Crandall- Research Project Analyst. Visit to Senate postponed till a later date.

4. Reports

--Nick Rogers: Will go to the state Academic Senate meeting in L.A. next week and will give us a report. Nick also reported on the Senate's handbook, put together by Maureen Stephens and Kim Myers, and handed out by Nick last week. Thanks!

--Estella Cox: 23 college campuses, including Shasta College, are being surveyed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. This will be used by the governor as the basis for funding decisions for the next six years. Thus, it's extremely important. Estella is also working on a small business card that will list the Senate's 11 main goals. This will be laminated and distributed.

5. Discussion Items

1. Complaint- Nata Greenleaf

--Nata Greenleaf wanted to know what the procedures are for filing a complaint. She felt it had taken too long (10 months) for her complaint to be put on the Senate's agenda. Since a major point of contention was the posting of the Senate agendas, Nick reviewed where agendas are placed. Mark Bongay spoke to student access to the minutes, claiming that the minutes were quite accessible to students. Dave Bush noted that the Senate web page is impossible to find, as well as many other web pages. Dave looked up the references to the Brown Act and suggested that we review it to make sure our actions match what's required on the Brown Act. Randy Reed noted that he prints up the agendas and posts them on his office door; he suggested we do this and also put a posting in the Lance. Several Senate members opined that the Senate really isn't in the business of hearing student grievances, nor was it ever.

2. Oregon Institute Of Technology- Outreach Campus/Reciprocity

--Jeff Cooper: Shasta College administrators recently visited the Oregon Institute of Technology about possibly opening some bachelor programs here. Officials from OIT did a follow-up visit to Shasta College. The big question is whether there can be reciprocity between students from Oregon and California. The rule in California is that if a county is contiguous to another state, then there's an automatic reciprocity. Thus,

Siskiyou has reciprocity with Oregon colleges. Lassen College has reciprocity with OIT even though they are not contiguous because they claim Modoc County as part of their district. Jeff noted that the chancellor makes decisions on reciprocity, and our state chancellor appears to be in favor of pursuing this. Under an agreement with OIT, a like number of students must be given permission to attend each others' schools. All discussions are just preliminary at this point. In California, we're getting no response, so we're pursuing schools in Oregon. The reciprocity would include tuition costs. OIT students could take our classes for \$11 a unit, and ours could take their classes for \$11 per unit.

3. Research and Grants

--Item removed from agenda.

4. Environmental Advisory Committee

--Dan Scollon: Dan reviewed the history of this committee, formed last year. He distributed the committee's first official recommendation, which he's hoping to have approved by the Senate, the Faculty Association, and CSEA, before it is forwarded to the President and Board. The proposal, found at www2.shastacollege.edu/envac/Proposal.htm, recommends the hiring of a dedicated environmental resource specialist. Though Dan's committee still does not have a job description, they have been collecting job descriptions. He noted we're being mandated by the state to have certain reductions in waste over the next few years; the committee is working on helping us meet these requirements. Nick proposed we put this proposal down as an action item for the next meeting at which time the EAC would have a draft of a job description.

6. Action Items

a. Compressed or Alternate Schedule

--Both Nick and Cathie Anderson presented proposals regarding the alternate calendar proposal. Cathie made a motion reading, "the Senate recommend we not adopt an alternate calendar for the Fall 2001 semester. Furthermore, the Academic Senate recommends that a joint committee of administrators, faculty, staff and students be formed to address the feasibility of an alternate calendar for Spring 2002. Specifically, the committee will clearly state the objectives of adopting an alternate calendar and then look at several different calendar options to see which best meets the objectives. Every attempt should be made to finish this study by February 2001." Dave Bush seconded this motion.

Discussion ensued, and it was suggested that the committee determine what the objectives of the calendar are. Nick asked that 1-2 adjunct faculty be on the committee. 10 faculty voted for the motion, and 4 voted against. The alternate calendar committee will meet Friday, November 3, at 3:00 p.m.

7. Other

a. Susan Anthis: Susan noted that NPG funds have been increased, and that the administration has been supportive of the increase to \$700 in staff development funds, but that we appear headed for a shortfall because of the increase in the number of requests for staff development unless modifications are made to the applications process. This week, NPG is discussing the application, award, and approval process with this issue in mind.

8. Adjournment- Next meeting-November 13, 2000