# Shasta College <br> Academic Senate Minutes <br> August 23, 2001 <br> Room 2202A 3:00 PM 

## Members Present:

Estella Cox
Sandy Johnson
Randy Reed
Philip Roché
Sue Hess
Raleigh Ross
Jeff Cooper
Dave Bush
Richard Saunders
Frank Nigro
Warren Lytle
Carolyn Borg
Susan Westler
Eileen Smith
Eve-Marie Arce
Chuck Spotts
Cathy Anderson

## Guests Present:

Ron Johnson
Jan Dinkel
Ed Neroda
Jim Poulsen
Brian Spillane
Ross Tomlin
Sharon Lowry
Mark Bongay

1. Call To Order: Meeting called to order at $3: 10$ p.m.
2. Approval Of Previous Minutes
a. Approval of May 14 Minutes (none this time, we'll save this item for the next meeting)
3. Reports
a. Reports (none this time, we'll save this item for the next meeting)
4. Discussion/Action items
5. Proposed 16 week calendar: Cathy Anderson opened the meeting by noting she had invited the deans to the meeting to help answer questions. She noted too that it was her opinion that if we failed to make a recommendation by the next Senate meeting, we would risk having no voice at all in this decision.

Chuck Spotts read a motion "The Academic Senate takes the position not to oppose the implementation of a 16 -week calendar. The Academic Senate has unresolved concerns regarding a 16 -week calendar and hence can not go on record as supporting the concept. These concerns include: The effect of the schedule on students enrolled in developmental classes; The effect of the schedule on enrollments in general; and the effect of the schedule on academic integrity." Carolyn Borg seconded the motion, and discussion ensued.

Several Senate members were concerned that this non-opposition might be perceived as support. Cathy read a similar motion from Sue Loring, a motion which did not come to the floor because of Sue's absence. Cathy reminded us of the Alternate Calendar subcommittee's work, and the June meeting with Jeff Cooper regarding the calendar. She distributed a handout on the Calendar, including a schedule outline and a table that shows what the options would be for 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-unit classes. Jeff noted that funding was not the main reason for adopting a calendar.

The various Center reps spoke to how the calendar would affect their individual centers. Richard Saunders noted that Fine Arts is opposed to the calendar. Under the mock calendar developed, some faculty would have no breaks and no lunch. Eve-Marie Arce noted that the schedule would also be difficult because of the 95 minute time blocks. Raleigh Ross noted that his area was also totally against the calendar. Sue Hess noted that faculty in her Center had trouble with the calendar because of difficulties with fitting all the content into the shortened calendar. Also, it would pose problems for students' work schedules. Randy Reed noted that his Center's faculty was concerned about how the calendar would affect lab hours. Estella Cox, representing adjunct faculty, noted she was
unable to evaluate the calendar because she hasn't seen the mock schedule yet. Cathy asked the deans to speak to this issue. Jim Poulsen noted that in his opinion, only lecture classes would work in the 2-day format for Science courses. For Extended Ed courses, he felt the calendar would be beneficial. Jeff noted that not all classes would have to be 2-days a week; 3-day or 4-day a week classes could be accommodated. Sharon Lowry noted that for her Center, the effect on adjunct would not be that dramatic. Eve-Marie noted that certain of her courses would work quite well under the new calendar while others wouldn't.

Dave Bush brought up a Senate Rostrum article about a state Senate committee's findings on the calendar issue. The committee noted that considerations of alternative calendars should not have as their primary focus increasing the budget; Dave noted his opposition to adopting a new calendar on the basis of funding alone. Eve-Marie reminded us that even in the early discussions of this calendar, other reasons for adopting the calendar were put forward, such as providing students with more scheduling flexibility and faster completion time. Sandy Johnson noted that in Business instructors continued to have concerns about the calendar. Carolyn Borg noted that she thought students would love the flexibility of the schedule. However, she had concerns about squeezing everything into the schedule from an academic point of view. Frank Nigro noted that Language Arts was evenly divided on the issue, and that there had been concerns about how 4- or 5 -unit courses would work under the alternate calendar. Susan Westler and Sue Hess noted concerns with putting their current classes into the calendar since it would increase their already overlong lab hours even more. Mark Bongay, ASB representative, noted that the ASB was inviting students to look at the mock schedule and to try to schedule their existing classes in the mock schedule to see if it would work for them. He invited the Senate to send in students to try out the schedule. The mock schedule will be available for them in Jeff Cooper's office.

The discussion turned to who or what type of students would benefit from this schedule. Frank pointed out that students would be able to work more during the summer with the alternate calendar. Dave pointed out they would be able to work less during the semester with the alternate calendar. Eileen Smith noted that she had concerns about some of the negative wording in the two motions forwarded; if we go forward with the calendar, we should go into it with a positive attitude.

The vote turned back to Chuck's proposal: "The Academic Senate takes the position not to oppose the implementation of a 16 -week calendar. The Academic Senate has unresolved concerns regarding a 16-week calendar
and hence can not go on record as supporting the concept. These concerns include: The effect of the schedule on students enrolled in developmental classes; The effect of the schedule on enrollments in general; and The effect of the schedule on academic integrity." Four voted in favor of Chuck's proposal. Eight voted against it. Dave Bush moved that we modify Chuck's motion. His motion stated: "The Academic Senate does not support the implementation of a 16-week calendar. The Academic Senate has unresolved concerns regarding a 16-week calendar and hence can not go on record as supporting the concept. These concerns include: The effect of the schedule on students enrolled in developmental classes; The effect of the schedule on enrollments in general; and the effect of the schedule on academic integrity." Sue Hess seconded the motion. Discussion ensued.

Chuck noted he had more concerns about contract issues, and about adopting something without going through a negotiation process first. Estella voted that we support an 18-week calendar for those centers that can't live with a $16-$ week one. This was rejected. Frank Nigro moved to postpone the vote until Monday. His motion stated: "We move to postpone until Monday, August 27, Dave Bush's motion that the Academic Senate does not support the implementation of a 16-week calendar. Center representatives should be allowed to poll their centers prior to the Monday vote." Raleigh Ross seconded this. The motion carried, with 8 voting in favor and 4 voting against. If the issue is not settled by Monday, Cathy will write a letter to the Vice President stating that the Senate was unable to reach a decision.

In the ensuing discussion, Eve-Marie put forward an idea that the Senate support consideration of a wide range of possible calendars. Jeff Cooper let it be known that in Instructional Council, there have been discussions about a 10 -week summer block that might include a wide range of different class blocks. So, to some extent, Eve-Marie's suggestion is already being explored. Dave Bush quoted from the Senate Rostrum article that schools considering a calendar switch should take 2 years to implement the schedule. Jeff noted that while he'd like to implement the schedule by Fall 2002, we could push back that time if we discovered we did not have enough time. Richard Saunders noted he was not convinced that a prima fascia case had been made yet that the 18-week system was broke and in need of fixing. He hoped, however, that whether the Senate votes yes or no, that this be the start of a discussion about calendars.
a. None.
7. Adjournment: Next meeting August 27.

