

**Shasta College
Academic Senate Minutes
September 24, 2001
Board Room - 3:10 PM**

Members Present:

Estella Cox
Sandy Johnson
Carolyn Borg
Raleigh Ross
Jeff Cooper
Dave Bush
Frank Nigro
Richard Saunders
Laura Valvatne
Sue Loring
Warren Lytle
Sue Hess
Eileen Smith
Dan Scollon
Cathy Anderson
Ron Marley

Guests Present:

Doug Treadway
Mark Bongay
Gary Lewis

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

a. Approval of September 17 minutes (Sandy Johnson moved approval, Richard Saunders seconded). The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

1. Reports: None

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Strategic Goals for 2001-2002. (Attachment.) The Strategic Planning Committee is recommending the six goals noted in the attachment. These goals need to go through the shared governance process before the college adopts them. Cathy Anderson reviewed the goals. Dave Bush had a question about the 5% instructional productivity increase specified in point 4. Doug Treadway stated that this had to do with faculty teaching underloads who would be reassigned projects. It would not have to do with increasing the number of students in class. A “demand schedule” (also point 4) is a schedule based partly on student-stated needs, not simply on faculty wishes. Point 6, regarding distance ed courses, was clarified to mean full-time faculty only. And the wording was amended so that “online” was substituted for “WebCT.”

Sue Loring raised concerns about goals such as the 2% increase in FTEs mentioned in point 1; she was concerned with how we would meet these goals, who would work to accomplish them. Doug replied that the 6 priorities listed here were the main priorities for the school and would be funded as such. Dave pointed out that on the NPG form for staff development funds, we are asked to state what strategic plan goal our requests would satisfy; given the 6 goals listed here, this would be impossible to answer in a way that would be justifiable. Dave Bush moved to adopt the goals; Richard Saunders seconded this. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Lifelong Learning: Dr. Treadway presented his project for developing a program for Lifelong Learning. This item was discussed in tandem with item “c” below.

c. Partnership for Excellence 2001-2002 (Attachment.) Doug presented the proposed PFE budget for 2001-2002, making some corrections and addressing the budget’s salient features. He stated that we will be starting a principle of graduating regular, tenure-track positions paid out of PFE money to the regular budget, so that they will not be paid long term through PFE. He noted the Life Long Learning Coordinator is envisioned as a 2-3 year position to address the needs of the elderly. The funding for it will go toward a non-credit institute and recruitment of those over 55 into regular programs. It should be seen as seed money to start a program that should be self-supporting. The enrollment anagement/matriculation item is 50% on PFE and 50% on regular funds. He also pointed out the Webmaster position and its importance. The expenditures under economic and workforce development should be seen as one time investments or

seed money. This has the potential to be self supporting some day. The undesignated reserve was corrected to read \$37,837. It will be used to pay the current employees on this list their salaries and benefits that were negotiated for this last year.

Sue Loring moved to make no recommendation on this budget as it could compromise the negotiations process. Dave Bush seconded this. Cathy Anderson said our support for this does not mean that we are approving this budget. Doug noted that he was following the same process followed in past years; he was unclear which process was not being followed. Cathy reminded us that several years ago, when PFE first came around, faculty had more say in how PFE was to be spent, and that was the concern.

Doug stated that about only 5-10% of the PFE budget is discretionary as much as been committed to tenure track positions, student employment, etc. Student employment comes toward the top of the list of PFE goals for student retention. Sue Loring noted the undesignated reserve figure had changed from the number she saw earlier. Gary Lewis mentioned the earlier version did not have student salaries.

Dave asked if studies are being done to show if the new programs (Hospitality, Gerontology, Dental Hygiene) are cost effective in generating FTES to support the programs. Doug said the auditors and Chancellor's office look at criteria including filling expressed regional needs, meeting PFE goals, and commitment to a comprehensive transfer and voc. ed. curriculums. Raleigh Ross asked about the five goals for PFE, and Jeff Cooper said he would send them to Raleigh and Cathy for distribution. It should also be on the State Academic Senate Web page.

The vote on Sue Loring's motion for the Senate to take no position on the PFE budget was 7 in favor, 5 opposed. (If the Senate had opposed the budget and could not come to an agreement with the administration, both sides would present their comments at the Board of Trustees meeting.)

d. Partnership for Excellence and the Shared Governance Process: Discussion followed on the Senate's role in shared governance for things such as this budget. The general feeling was the Senate should have input on the planning decisions such as new programs and positions rather than the budget figures themselves.

e. Meeting Dates: Cathy Anderson expressed concern the Senate needs to deal with things in a more timely manner. She proposed a third meeting each month. It was decided a third meeting would be called if needed.

Cathy said we have a bit of a backlog now so it will be necessary to have a meeting next Monday, October 1.

f. Adjunct Faculty Hiring Criteria Procedures (Attachment.): Not discussed.

5. Other

a. None.

6. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting will be on October 1.