Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, April 25, 2005 * 3:00-5:00 * Room 1108

MINUTES

	Executive Committee members present				
x	**Cathy Anderson**	x	**Toby Bodeen**	x	**Carolyn Borg**
x	Dave Bush		David Cooper	x	Kendall Crenshaw
	Jeff Cummings	x	Kevin Fox	x	Scott Gordon
	Pamela Highet	x	Vickie Kimbrough	x	Gary Lewis
x	**Sue Loring**	x	Warren Lytle	x	**Ron Marley**
	Susan Meacham		Michael Pitcher	x	Frank Nigro
	Marsha Ray		Alan Spivey	x	Chuck Spotts
x	Ramon Tello	x	Terry Turner	x	Laura Valvatne

x	Andrea Williams		Dave Wright		
Other faculty present					
x	Doug Milhous				
Guests present					
x	Jane Harmon	x	Cassandra Ryan		

1. Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes –04/11/05 (1 Attachment): Warren Lytle moved approval; Toby Bodeen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

    a. Cheating Policy-progress report by Frank: Frank reported that he, Lenore Frigo, Mark Kemp, and Carolyn Singh are serving on this committee. They've reviewed Board Policy, language on the academic honesty and the honor code in the Course Catalog, and have attempted to ascertain whether there are any existing procedures in place for what happens when a student is sent to Student Services. They did not have anything to present to the Senate today, but here are several things they are working on:

        1) They will make some minor suggested changes to Board Policy
        2) They are working on plans on how best to disseminate information about academic honesty to instructors. For example, they are drafting some sample language on academic honesty for instructors to use in their first-day handouts, and they are also putting together a sheet on how to discourage academic dishonesty.
        3) They are drafting an administrative procedure for what happens once a student commits a more serious violation of the honor code.

    There was a question about whether anyone from Student Services was on the committee. Cathy Anderson had sent out an invitation, but no one stepped forward from that area. Laura Valvatne, however, noted she had volunteered to be on the committee; Frank will include her in future meetings.

Gary Lewis noted that in the catalog, the language on academic honesty appears in two different places and needs to be centralized. He also noted that all newly hired full-time instructors are being asked about academic honesty as part of their interview process.

Terry Turner noted that Carolyn Singh's presentation on how to prevent plagiarism was quite good and should be distributed.

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. AP 4500 (No Attachments): *Revisiting AP 4500 to vote on the revised version.*

Cathy asked if anyone wanted to discuss changes to this document. No one did. Chuck Spotts moved approval of the changes. Kevin Fox seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Early Alert Progress Reporting System (No Attachments): *We will vote on this proposal that has been recommended to us by the Matriculation Committee.*

Dave Bush moved that we adopt the Early Alert Progress Reporting System. Chuck Spotts seconded the motion.

In the ensuing discussion, various center reps reported on how their centers felt about this system. Terry Turner noted that faculty in her Division were concerned that the system might "coddle" students, and they were wondering whether the letter, which they liked, could somehow be put in everyone's first-day handout. They also raised concerns about students who *don't* get the early alert coming back to us saying, "Hey, you didn't tell me!" when they fail. Would they use this as a basis for legal action? Sue Loring said that there was no case she's aware of where a lawsuit was brought against faculty by students. Terry also noted that some instructors in her area have around 600 students, so doing progress reports could be overwhelming. It was pointed out that only a portion of each instructor's students would need the progress reports, and at this point the instructor could still opt not to use the system.

Chuck Spotts noted that at first, he too was worried about the time this would take, but then he realized it would only take about an hour, which in the scheme of things is not a lot of time. He did not like Terry's suggestion about requiring something go in an instructor's first-day handout, and the same goes for the suggested language on academic honesty Frank was discussing above.

Warren Lytle noted that the SINR folks were overwhelmingly against this and were working on their own system.

Kevin Fox noted that this system would be another reason to have student email accounts; the school could email students directly with their progress reports. Cassandra Ryan said that we are moving toward this.

Frank Nigro noted that Language Arts was at first against the system, but when they saw the research, they adopted a "we won't stand against this" position. However, they weren't convinced it would be very effective. Frank thought the system was a good idea, though he worried that if it were not made mandatory, the same faculty currently do progress reports of one form or another would keep doing it, and those who weren't would keep not doing it. Hence, the new system would just result in status quo.

There was some discussion about whether this indeed would be made mandatory. It will have to go to negotiations to become mandatory, but in the meantime, it will be designated a "professional obligation."

Ron Marley noted that his center already does this sort of thing. However, they don't necessarily like the idea of adopting a system that might not work as well as what they're already using. Could they keep using this system or would they have to adopt the new one? Cathy suggested that might be a center that could opt not to use the system.

There were a number of questions about how the progress reports would work. Right now, we'd just be able to check boxes and enter in letter codes for attendance, poor test grades, missing work, or "other," but not enter written comments. Newer versions of Datatel may let us enter in comments.

Cassandra asked whether we would be giving students access to the progress reports on WebAdvisor. We will not.

The motion carried with one no vote.

c. SLO Cycle (handout at meeting): *The Senate needs to adopt a model SLO cycle.*

Cathy showed the Senate an overhead of a new SLO cycle model. She reminded us that there's a subcommittee that's working on this and on some sample SLOs. She gave us a sample SLO for Jeff Cummings' program, and then showed how it would work in the model SLO cycle. She did another for statistics. Some suggestions were made as far as the wording ("Where will the delivery" changed to "In which classes will," etc.). In the assessment loop section, she clarified that the "Revise Methodology" bubble might or might not be necessary, depending on whether the SLO was effective as set up.

Scott Gordon moved approval with the changes above; Terry Turner seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

d. Excellent Educator (Attachments from Vickie in separate email): *Only Executive Committee members get to vote on Excellent Educator.*

There was some discussion about whether we should include student input in this award. Cathy noted that the students already have some awards for faculty, and that this award's criteria have largely to do with things that students have no ability to give input on.

The first round of voting was approval voting. There were three nominees, and the Senate was instructed to write down any names that we wanted to stay on the ballot.

In the second round of voting, Lemoine Waite was selected as this year's Excellent Educator.

e. Publishing Guidelines for Instructors (No Attachments): *We need a subcommittee to propose a policy with guidelines for instructors to sell their course content.*

Some faculty are beginning to write books or have written books, and some are writing internet courses. The question for the Senate is an ethical question: what are the ethics about publishing your work and then selling it to your students?

In the past, some instructors who have profited from their textbooks have sought to give the money back to students. For example, when Doug Soccio published his textbook, he donated the proceeds to student groups here on campus. Laura Valvatne did the same.

Several Senate members (Vickie Kimbrough, Laura) shared their insights into publishing and how much profit textbook authors and publishers might or might not make.

The Senate decided that it was worth researching to see if other schools have policies on this. If they do, we can consider developing our own policy or ethics statement. If they don't, we can drop the issue. Laura and Vickie both volunteered for the committee, and Cathy will send out an email to the faculty to see if we can get other volunteers.

5. Other:

a. Cathy presented the revised definition of SLO that come back to us from the Planning Committee. Their definition reads:

Upon completion of a course at Shasta College, a student will be able to demonstrate increased knowledge or skills relative to the learning objectives of that particular course.

The question was whether this was a good general SLO for the college. Apparently, our accreditation report requires us to say what our institutional SLO is. Dave suggested that we adopt as our institutional SLO the body of SLOs that we've developed.

Terry Turner moved that we adopt the following definition of an institutional SLO: "The institutional SLO refers to the body of SLOs created for courses, certificates, degrees, and Student Services programs." Kevin Fox seconded the motion. The motion carried with one no.

Ramon Tello wondered if it were possible to adopt such a general SLO for whole programs. This is something we will consider in the future.

b. Cathy noted that Sharon Lowry has resigned to take a Vice President job at Antelope Valley College. There will be a one-year interim position opening up here for the Dean of Math, Business and Technology.

6. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, May 09, 2005 in Room 1108.