

**Shasta College  
Academic Senate Minutes  
December 10, 2001  
Board Room - 3:10 PM**

**Members Present:**

Estella Cox  
Jeff Cooper  
Dave Bush  
Carolyn Borg  
Dan Scollon  
Richard Saunders  
Frank Nigro  
Richard Saunders  
Sandy Johnson  
Chuck Spotts  
Warren Lytle  
Cathy Anderson  
Jennifer McCandless  
Sue Loring  
Laura Valvatne  
Randy Reed  
Nick Rogers  
Phillip Roché  
Teresa Degnan

**Guests Present:**

Doug Treadway  
Brian Spillane

1. Call To Order: Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m.
2. Approval Of Previous Minutes

1. Approval of November 26 minutes (Chuck Spotts moved approval, Raleigh Ross seconded). The motion carried unanimously.

### 3. Reports

1. Hiring Priorities List: Dr. Treadway visited the Senate to discuss the Cabinet's rationale for the differences between the list the Cabinet presented to us and the list the Instructional Council presented to the Cabinet. He began by explaining that the list was still subject to change, and that what the deans wanted might end up being something different than what he wanted.

Cathy Anderson noted that the concern among faculty was that the Senate had supposedly approved something that was different than what had been forwarded by Instructional Council. Doug said that the lists were basically identical. Doug noted that he wanted to work on replenishing positions where faculty have retired and not been replaced.

Dave Bush asked for clarification on positions in his Center, positions which, he noted, were prioritized in almost the reverse order from what his Center recommended.

Sue Loring expressed concerns about hiring tenure track positions for programs that don't have an established need in terms of enrollments. She cited Gerontology and Environmental Technology as examples. Doug said that with such positions, only PFE funds would be used initially. Adjunct faculty, he noted, could not develop such programs as effectively as full-time faculty. Richard Saunders asked if we are obligated to keep the faculty member on board if, after a few years, the program ended up being a bust. Doug said that we were not, but he reemphasized that the programs mentioned would grow in enrollments.

### 4. Discussion/Action Items

- a. Retreat Rights Policy (Attachment): The subcommittee presented their recommended changes to the Senate Retreat Rights Policy and Procedures. Dave explained alterations he made to the committee. Dave Bush moved that we adopt the policy as amended. Chuck Spotts seconded this. Jeff Cooper suggested some further changes. Cathy Anderson asked if this policy was consistent with and mimetic of the Hiring Procedures. Jeff questioned the 60-day consideration period, suggesting that any action take place during the academic year. It was decided to change this to 150 calendar days. The motion passed, 15

in favor, 1 against. Dave volunteered to rework the Senate's policy one more time as per the Senate's recommendations.

Regarding the Board policy on retreat rights, Dave moved that we adopt the subcommittee's recommended changes. Raleigh seconded this. Because a number of Senate members wanted more time to reconsider this, the motion was withdrawn. Chuck and Cathy volunteered to re-examine the policy and to bring their recommendations to a future meeting for possible action.

b. Hiring Priorities Procedure (Attachment): A subcommittee was to present its recommended changes to the Hiring Priorities Procedure. Discussion of this was postponed till a future meeting.

c. CLEP (Attachment via Randy Reed): A subcommittee (Carolyn Borg and Randy Reed) presented a recommended procedure for granting CLEP credit. Their procedure was based on CLEP programs done at other schools, especially ones using Datatel. The units a student could be granted would apply to elective credit only. This policy would allow us to meet the standards of the "service opportunity college." The scores for the tests were normed to what other schools were using. Jennifer McCandless moved to approve these changes; Chuck seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

d. Excellent Educator (No Attachment): A subcommittee (Dave Bush, Raleigh Ross, and Randy Reed) made recommendations for modifying the Excellent Educator selection process. Cathy reminded us what two main issues were. 1) with students nominations, the Excellent Educator award becomes a popularity contest; and 2) the award should not be a retirement award, but rather an award based on criteria that define teaching excellence and the commitment a candidate has to the school and community (these criteria define the Excellent Educator award, as well as the Hayward award). The Senate discussed a proposal sent via email by Randy Reed.

Discussion centered on how to do ranking in such a way so as to avoid, as much as possible, subjectivity. One suggestion was that each department be given a ranking scale to use in choosing their top person. This would be submitted along with a narrative of why s/he was nominated. Cathy used the whiteboard to show schematically how students, faculty, and departments are involved in making the nominations. Chuck suggested that each department should be able to nominate their candidates in any way they saw fit. Estella Cox asked if adjuncts could be nominated; they cannot, since the winner is forwarded as our nominee for the Hayward

Award, and this award requires a full-time faculty member. It was suggested we come up with an award specifically for adjuncts.

Cathy volunteered to rewrite the procedure for nominations and to forward it to us for discussion at the next Senate meeting.

e. Grade Change: The ASB has asked that we reconsider the 2-year limit on the grade change policy, changing it to 3 or even 4 years. This would only be for a grade change when an error has been made in the grading. Chuck moved that we change the policy to allow for 4 years for a grade change. Jennifer seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

## 5. Other

a. Jeff reported that the summer schedule has been changed from June 10-July 16. The last week will have 5 days. Block scheduling will take place this summer, with 2-hour blocks being scheduled.

6. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:44. Next Meeting: Monday, January 28, 2002.