Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, May 24, 2004
3:00-5:00

Room 1109

Minutes

Members Present

Cathy Anderson

Chuck Spotts
Terry Turner
Susan Meacham
Frank Nigro
Warren Lytle
Ted Lord
Raleigh Ross
Dan Scollon
Gary Lewis
Andrea Williams
Scott Gordon
Vickie Kimbrough
David Cooper
Laura Valvatne
Toby Bodeen
Dave Bush

Guests

Ron Johnson

1. Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes 05/10/04 (1 Attachment): Chuck Spotts moved approval; Terry Turner seconded. Item 4a. was modified slightly. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

a. Envac Committee-*Dan Scollon*: Dan Scollon gave an update on what is happening with the Environmental Advisory Committee. Their annual report is now posted at their website. He noted many things are taking place on campus (all the new construction, for example) that have environmental ramifications. The committee's role, as he sees it, should have and tries to have a say in these things. They've put together sample environmental policies for the campus, including a hazardous materials business plan and a draft nuisance animal policy, and they continue to work on the waste diversion effort. The school has been able to meet the state's 50% waste reduction goal this year, but only because of all the trees that fell in December's storm. Cans and bottle diversion has been very successful, though there are problems still with recycling receptacles getting emptied in a timely fashion. Dan and other committee members have occasionally found themselves undertaking this chore. Dan turned to a few internal challenges the committee is facing and noted the committee is looking forward to working with the new administration.

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Program Assessment- (no Attachment): *Review of the 'Report of the Joint Committee on Program Assessment'.*

Cathy Anderson gave a re-cap where we are. The Joint Committee on Program Assessment was appointed by the Senate. The purpose of the report they produced is to protect faculty and programs from arbitrary cuts; it's to legitimize the process when something goes on the chopping block.

Ted Lord opened discussion. He had been involved in the Aviation Maintenance program which was cut in 2001, so he has first-hand experience with how things used to work. He and Raleigh Ross both praised the new, proposed process, but they had a number of specific concerns which they detailed on a handout that was distributed to the Senate.

First, they would have liked to see more vocational people involved with the committee. Second, Ted noted that all the statewide voc ed meetings he's been to have emphasized that there should be an Academic Senate vocational

subcommittee; Ted recommended we put such a thing in place. Third, they feel that some of the data collected on vocational programs has not been accurate and has not accurately reflected key stats on, say, retention rates.

Raleigh and Ted were concerned about the average program enrollments and how they are determined. These enrollments are one of the early alert criteria for program discontinuance. Classes in small programs might start off with, say, 24 students. By the end, there might be 14 who are able to pass on to the next level. The two questioned what number gets used to determine what number the early alert percentage is based on. The Senate felt that the Census date number was the obvious one to base the percentage upon. However, the percentages we're defining here need also to be re-evaluated eventually because they may not be suitable. It was pointed out that such figures are just triggers that would lead the school to look at the program; they would not automatically mean it would be discontinued.

The fourth early alert criterion was "program cost per FTE" for one semester. Raleigh and Ted had questions about what costs should be included, what the funding sources were, etc. One of the thresholds for early alert status is when a program's cost rises to 165% of the campus average. These questions should in part be clarified when we define the term "program." So, we need to define "program" and "program costs."

They then turned to the fifth early alert criterion: "Average number of Program courses cancelled (4 semesters)." Raleigh argued that this would lead to teachers not offering innovative new sections since they might not make, and this would be detrimental to the students.

Several of those who were on the subcommittee that authored this document (Ron Johnson, Vickie Kimbrough, Terry Turner) noted that the idea behind this process is to let it run for a couple of years to test it and see how good or bad it is. The committee anticipates it will have bugs that need to be worked out.

The Senate decided to send the draft process back to the subcommittee to define these terms: *program, retention, program cost*, and *grace period*. We also need a list of what the actual programs are. The idea is that we would be able to implement this for spring 2005 at the latest.

The Senate turned two other concerns about the process. Chuck questioned the fact that only 3 out of 8 people on the program discontinuance were to be faculty members; he felt this violated the concept of shared governance. He'd like to see the committee composed of a majority of faculty. This too will be sent back to the committee for consideration.

Cathy would like to see assurance that, as with Institutional Tenure Review Committee, there be some built in continuity, that 50% of committee members be held over from one year to the next.

Gary noted that if we ever get to page 7, where a program is actually discontinued, instead of "end of the semester" for when this is determined, it should be given a specified date. The subcommittee will re-visit this issue too.

Chuck pointed out numerous other specific items for re-consideration. These were noted by Ron Johnson for reconsideration by the subcommittee.

Gary suggested putting voluntary discontinuance of a program earlier on in the document.

Dave noted that this is a great report, but it's not a process yet. So, it needs to be condensed. He recommended putting the flowchart at the front and the explanations thereafter. This would make the whole thing much more clear.

Terry Turner noted she is really overcommitted ("over-committeed"?) as far as committees go and asked to step down. Ted Lord will take her place.

Regarding the subcommittee itself, three of the faculty members are in programs, and one is not. The composition of the committee is a good one.

b. Proposed Tenure Review Committees 2004-2005 (1 Attachment)
The only new approvals were for the new, potential English and Speech positions. Otherwise, there were no changes. Chuck moved approval of the proposed new committees; Warren Lytle seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

c. Proposed Changes to Program Review Schedule (1 Attachment)

Terry moved to approval of the schedule; Warren seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. One small change was made: "First id" was changed to "First Aid." Gary Lewis noted that there are some additional programs that may be going on this list. He'll forward a list of these to Cathy for discussion at a future meeting.

5. Other

6. Adjournment: The Senate adjourned at 4:57.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, August 23, 2004, in Room 1109 (if available).