

Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, January 24, 2005
3:00-5:00

Room 1108

Minutes

Members Present

Susan Meacham

Frank Nigro

Warren Lytle
Chuck Spotts
Scott Gordon
Carolyn Borg
Kevin Fox
Terry Turner
Vickie Kimbrough
Kendall Crenshaw
Laura Valvatne
Gary Lewis
Sue Loring
Gary Lewis
Ramon Tello
Andrea Williams

Guests

Jane Harmon

1. Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m. Vickie Kimbrough led the meeting in place of Cathy Anderson.

2. Approval of Minutes –12/13/04 (1 email from Frank): Warren Lytle moved approval; Chuck Spotts seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

a. Changes to the Distance Ed Committee: Frank Nigro reported that the Distance Ed Committee has made a few changes, as per Mary Retterer's suggestions. The committee is now officially to report to the Senate and to Cabinet. The committee's authority to develop policies and procedures involving distance education is recognized. The membership of the committee has been expanded to include a representative from Admissions (Cassandra Ryan), two additional at-large faculty members (Cliff Gottlieb and Megan McQueen), and two representatives from DSPS (Tom Morehouse and Mike Buckley). In addition, the committee will have two additional meetings, albeit online (6 meetings total this semester, beginning February 4).

There was a question about whether the Senate's proposal for a Technology Committee will go forward. Gary Lewis noted that with Doug Meline reporting directly to Mary under the proposed reorganization, the administration is making a commitment to technology, so the Tech Committee will probably be set up when this all happens. Several senators including Kevin Fox, Frank Nigro, and Sue Loring, have requested to be put on that committee if/when it is formed. Gary also noted concerns about the Title III grant, which is set to expire in October, and our need to show we've "institutionalized" parts of it. He said we're establishing a "sinking fund" to budget for tech replenishment. Cabinet has also committed to having an institutional line-item budget to supplies to replace, for example, burnt-out projector bulbs. This part of the discussion related to last semester's Senate wish list on campus-wide technology needs.

b. Kevin Fox reported on the student email issue that he and Scott Gordon have been researching. Kevin and Scott believe implementing a student email system will be cost effective and that the benefits outweigh the costs. They've done research at other schools and noted other schools reported being delighted with it. The one downside is cost, which at this point is an unknown, since no school was able to give them a bottom line on how much student email cost them. A recommendation was made to Cabinet last semester to go forward with student email accounts. Gary noted he'll bring this up to Cabinet tomorrow and said that we need Technology to take the next step as far as determining the actual costs.

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Revised Hiring Priorities List (No Attachments): *A change to the approved list has been proposed by Cabinet. Gary will bring copies to the Senate meeting.*

Gary Lewis distributed a handout listing the most current list showing retirees who will and will not be replaced, and he gave some background on how this list was developed. Gary asked for feedback on the hiring list.

The hiring replacement decisions went first through Instructional Council. They had difficulty coming to a consensus. The initial list went from I.C. to Senate. The list made it to Cabinet, and Cabinet was concerned with declining enrollments. This seems to be happening across the board at rural community colleges. We have almost the same number of full-time students, but they're taking fewer units. Cabinet thus took a conservative look at the list. They wanted to see if we could get by in some positions using adjunct faculty.

Gary detailed some of the difficulties we're dealing with (difficulty finding coaches to travel; the situation with the baseball coach, who does an overload practically every semester). I.C. has also been given a heads up that has not yet been formalized that Michael Pitcher is resigning at the end of this fall semester. He and his wife will soon be teaching in Turkey, a full professorship. It's very difficult to find anyone to teach Chemistry, so they want to keep this a full time position and to get an ad out there right away. We're impacted in Biology and Chemistry.

The list Gary presented us with from Cabinet does not affect our 75/25 full-time to part-time split. We will still meet that split if we proceed with Cabinet's proposed list. Right now we have 155 full-time faculty. We must have 143 next year to make our 75/25 split. With the new changes, we'd be at 148. Sue Loring asked for clarification on whether all of the hours for the positions that are not being replaced would be backfilled by adjunct faculty? Gary said that yes, that was the case. He also confirmed that all the hours (pay and benefits) as well as the hiring process are being budgeted for. For full-time positions not being filled this time around, the idea is to replace them in a tiered fashion, starting next year. In what order we'd replace them will have to be renegotiated every year. The Senate did not take a stance on the list.

Discussion then turned to reorganization. Gary talked of the wide efforts the administration has made to get feedback from everyone on this. Gary is committed to coming up with something that won't wrinkle too many feathers and that will be a positive with the school, but he knows it won't please everyone. One issue that came up was whether to go with 4 or 5 deans. I.C. unanimously wanted to go to 5 deans; reducing to 4 was felt a bit too ambitious. The Athletic Director and a Dean would be combined. There were concerns that the Director wouldn't have a job to step back into, but Title 5 allows us to combine the two positions without eliminating the Director position. The new title would be Dean of PSSF/Athletic Director.

Gary believes we'll operate as effectively with two fewer overall positions as we are with them, and the change brings significant cost savings. With the Dean of Extended Education, we're opting not to replace the Director of Tehama. However, we will be moving the Dean of Extended Education to fulfill both the roles and base it in Red Bluff. It's unclear what will happen with internet classes and how they fit in. Currently, they're under Extended Education, but the instructional deans would like to manage that part of Extended Ed themselves, so this is still being debated.

There was some additional discussion of how many students should be allowed in an online class, how many online classes you can teach, and related issues.

b. Gerontology (1 email): *Read the email from Caryn that I forwarded to you.*

Vickie Kimbrough reminded us of an email discussion between Cathy Anderson and Caryn Bailey about whether to remove the Gerontology classes from the catalog since we no longer have an instructor in this area. Laura Valvatne noted that they had talked about this as their SS meeting last week. She said that they had discussed keeping the courses on the books for now, just in case the position might be reconsidered. Laura asked to talk to Brian Spillane before we make any decisions on this.

If the position were to be filled at some point in the future, we were told, then the courses would still have to be rewritten for our Curriculum Council, though not for the state, so there's some advantage to keeping them on the books. There was some concern about whether or not this was misleading to have the courses in the books, even though we're not offering them. There was a question about whether we can remove this from the catalog without removing the program.

The Senate decided to table this until we can get more information. We'll leave the courses in the catalog until we find out if we can remove just the catalog information. We'll ask Caryn Bailey to keep things status quo for now.

On a side note, Gary noted we're probably going to publish an online, 2-year catalog, which will be updated twice a year. It allows us to save a lot of money in mailings/paper.

c. Developing the SLO Cycle (1 Attachment): *Now that we have a definition for SLO, we need to outline the SLO cycle. A draft to start discussion is attached.*

Vickie asked those who initiated the SLO cycle to speak to what they came up with. Kevin Fox drafted the SLO cycle (see attachment) after the SLO workshops in Sacramento. Jeff Cummings, Vickie reminded us, offered his construction tech courses as guinea pigs for this process. Vickie used the following to illustrate the

process and to start us off: constructing a cabinet to construction-industry standards. Chuck Spotts wrote the following on the board for this possible SLO as it relates to the first three phases on Kevin's SLO cycle:

- 1: **State/Revise SLO**: construct a cabinet to industry-level standards
- 2: **State/Revise Assessment tool**: an expert checks the completed cabinet versus a cabinet rating system devised by the instructors, a scale of 1-5, for example.
- 3: **State/Revise Criteria for success**: the student meets the SLO if the completed cabinet scores 4.5/5.0 or above.

If we find the criteria are too high, we can adjust them eventually. Ramon Tello suggested we call this Shasta SLO.

5. Other

6. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, February 08, 2005 in Room 1108.