

**Shasta College
Academic Senate Meeting
Minutes
February 26, 2001**

Members Present:

Estella Cox
Warren Lytle
Nick Rogers
Ron Marley
Kathy Anderson
Dave Bush
Craig Thompson
Dan Scollon
Phillip Roche
Eve Marie Arce
Sandy Johnson
Richard Saunders
Randy Reed

Materials handed out:

- Excellent Educator – Estella Cox
- Approved Minutes from Feb. 7, 2001 – Nick Rogers
- Academic Senate Goals – Nick Rogers
- Alternative Calendar: “Possible Length of Appropriate Courses” - Ken Hart, Planning and Research Office
- Part-time/Temporary Positions Hiring Criteria, Policies and Procedures and Flow Chart – Pat Demo

Guests Present

Cathy Anderson
Sue Petter (sp?)
Benna Starrett
Ken Hart
Pat Demo

I.Call to order

1. Occurred at 3:05pm

II.Approval of Minutes

Warren moved 1st for approval; seconded by Craig Thompson. Approved unanimously

III.Guests

Ken Hart: expertise is within institutional research and strategic planning; Director of Planning and Research here at Shasta College. Mission statement and responsibilities have been developed for this office. Will return to a later meeting to discuss these further but mentioned some functions: assist college community by providing data and planning so that decisions can be better informed; collect analyze and evaluate data and then disseminate that data for planning including strategic planning, student and faculty surveys, alternate calendar. Ken gave a handout illustrating course scheduling possibilities and how a classroom might be utilized. He also described as the potential convenience for student scheduling within the outline.

IV.Reports

a. Nick: March 30 is the Area A meeting, at Modesto JC, and State Academic meeting is set for April 19-21 in San Francisco. Nick and Estella will attend latter meeting. Funds may exist for an additional person to travel and Nick asked all to consider. Other meetings (i.e. Curriculum Institute meeting in July, State Leadership Training in June) do have monies budgeted and occur later in the year. See Nick for details.

b. Estella: reported a little bit on Jeff Cooper's health and circulated a thank you card from Jeff. Estella also circulated copies of the Excellent Educator handout. Estella asked for members to distribute handout through center offices by having them copied and placed in full-time and part-time mailboxes. A list of nominees is needed for the late March meeting. Richard suggested that Royce make copies and then distribute campus wide. Kim will be asked to put up posters as well for Excellent Educator.

c. Elections for "At-Large" and Adjunct senate positions are nearing. New senators will take office in late May. Estella requests suggestions for "At-Large" senators.

d. Nick has commented that the current nominee for the Hayward Award has refused the honor. The state issues the Hayward award which is selected by committee at that level.

V. Discussion/Action Items

a. WF grades: guests Sue Petter and Benna Starett from Financial Aid began to give background describing the WF policy and its' relationship to veterans and other students. Part of their job is to evaluate if a student has "dropped" by not attending or if the student actually failed. Financial aid must go back to the 50% point if a drop date cannot be validated. They asked about senate opinion.

Dave Bush summarized the senate's position from the meeting on Feb. 12: the senate decided that the WF grade should not be used on the campus.

Further discussion occurred about attendance records and how financial aid must deal with veteran's affairs. Warren felt that the policy, as an optional grading system, could not be applied fairly. Eva described the difficulty in evaluating absences. Craig and Dan discussed the 50% and 75% deadline. Craig made the suggestion that the financial aid student could secure a faculty signature tracking attendance through the course of the semester but others pointed out the logistic difficulty to do so for all involved (financial aid office, faculty, etc.). Dave asked about counseling of the students on this issue and Ms. Starett noted that they are made aware of payback policies and the associated deadlines.

Discussion about the payback amounts of financial aid ensued including the 60% cut-off for the general financial aid student and the 100% cut-off for veterans: If a student makes these deadlines, they do not have to pay back the financial aid.

b. Hiring Priorities: handout and draft procedures were circulated among the senators. The handout is the result of committee work on the issue (Frank, Warren, Cathy and Dave). Dave outlined minor changes to the handout, mainly typographical errors associated only with Step 3, of the drafted procedure. It was clarified that the draft was for new positions, not replacement positions. Nick described conversation with Doug Treadway regarding the senate's statement from the Feb. 12 meeting and the hiring priorities/procedures of this past semester. Gerontology and Hospitality Management positions were described as PFE hires. Nick asked about student numbers to support such hires. Treadway expressed concern about Hospitality Management and student support. Treadway would like to discuss the hiring priorities and the draft procedures for new hiring during the March 20 senate meeting. Discussion followed.

Dave Bush moved that the procedure should be adopted and Eva seconded. Cathy then recommends that we send this procedure, with minor corrections, to the Board and Treadway. Dan noted that the procedures should be modified to describe "new" hires and this will be included. The motion was approved unanimously.

Estella asked about hiring procedures for part-timers. Nick noted that the state academic senate describes that part-timers should be hired in a similar fashion to full-timers. Dave noted that this set of procedures is mainly for contractual, full time new hires that are created positions. Further discussion on hiring procedures for part-timers included how it might mirror fulltimer procedures and how FSA's are assigned.

Estella asked why there an individual is typically not allowed to teach up to the maximum of 60% of a full-timers load. The load formula for part-timer limits was discussed which varies according to FSA and full-timers load. Nick noted the way in which the hours are paid to part-timers in very different in different FSA areas and is based full-timer loads with the

same or similar FSA. Estella would like to consider why multiple part-timers are brought in to teach several sections of the same class and suggested having one part-timer teach the maximum load over the multiple courses before hiring an additional part-timer.

Hiring and “firing” of part-timers was discussed including procedures. The topic was largely considered to be a Faculty Association matter. Nick noted that the senate could make a recommendation regarding hiring and retention of part-timer’s to the Faculty Association. More discussion followed regarding part-timers hiring and the procedures. Examples were given of poor hiring procedures especially in the Outreach Programs. Cathy noted that these procedures are in place but perhaps it should be reviewed and that maybe the senate should push for the policy to be applied to *all* hires. Eva considered whether or not this subject should be brought back on the senate table and reviewed. Cathy retrieved the “Handbook for Selection Committees” from the personnel office. She could not find the procedures she thought were in place within the handbook and she left to ask Pat Demo to find the procedures. Dave made a clarification: part-timers are not considered “contract” (full-time) while part-timers are considered “probationary”.

Nick mentioned that he thought very little peer evaluation of part-timer was being done. Dave noted that the administration, a few years ago, did not want to financially support full-timers to go out and evaluate part-timers. Nick will place this topic on the next agenda as hiring and retention impact instructional quality and fall under the senate’s purview.

Pat Demo found the procedures Cathy noted earlier and brought them into the meeting. Titled “Part-time/Temporary Positions Hiring Criteria, Policies and Procedures and Flow Chart”, Pat distributed several copies. She stayed for questions regarding the procedures especially for those associated with Outreach programs. Pat expressed surprise and concern regarding some of the examples advanced by senate members. She felt that personnel may not receive all of the information needed to evaluate a candidate and some individuals may not have been held to the same hiring quality as others. Upon questioning from Dan, Pat described the policy regarding part-timer’s: they are supposed to be student evaluated and undergo peer review during their first semester. Cathy asked Pat about the revisions that she might make if she had the time and Pat suggested maybe forming a subcommittee to evaluate the procedures. A subcommittee was formed including Estella, Eve, and Randy to review the procedures and report next meeting.

c. Goals: Nick discussed the handout associated with senate goals and asked about additions and modifications. Part-timer accountability and mentoring were issue brought up by Ron, Dan, and Eva for goals. More discussion followed regarding part-timer quality and review.

A quorum was lost at about 4:40 and Nick moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50.

Items not reached on the agenda include:

V. d. Part-time issues

e. Other