

Approved Dec. 8, 2008
Academic Senate
Executive Committee Meeting
November 24, 2008; 3:00-4:45 p.m.
Room 1108

Minutes:

| Executive Committee members present | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|----------------------|
| X | Cathy Anderson | X | Terry Bailey | X | Candace Byrne |
| | Craig Thompson | X | Frank Nigro | | Kendall Crenshaw |
| X | Leo Fong | | Ramón Tello | | Karen Henderson |
| X | Alan Spivey | | Jason Kelly | X | Leimone Waite |
| X | Shelly Presnell | X | Iraja Sivadas | X | Susan Meacham |
| X | Doug Milhous | X | Andrea Williams | X | Ray Nicholas |
| X | Jennifer McCandless | X | Terrie Snow | | Heather Wylie |
| X | Brad Peters | X | Maureen Stephens (N/V) | X | Lenore Frigo (N/V) |
| | Dave Wright (N/V) | | Ron Marley (N/V) | | Lois Cushnie (N/V) |
| X | William Cochran (N/V) | | | | |
| Other faculty present | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|---|---------------|---|------------------|
| X | Tom Glass | | | | |
| Guests | | | | | |
| X | Kevin O'Rorke | X | Joan Bosworth | X | Dr. Lucha Ortega |

1. Call to Order

Cathy Anderson called the meeting to order at 3:03.

2. Approval of Minutes – 10/27/08 (1 attachment)

Terry Bailey moved approval of the minutes from the October 27, 2008, meeting. Ray Nicholas seconded. Maureen Stephens noted these corrections: in 3a, Leimone Waite and her crew put in plants, not pants, at the Trinity campus; in 4a, the correct spelling is Maureen. The minutes were approved with these changes.

3. Opportunity for public comment

a. This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the executive Committee on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

No members of the public were present.

4. Reports

a. Report from the Senate President (Cathy Anderson)

Dr. Cochran spoke about his positive feelings about the accreditation site visit. Interest centered on program reviews at the administrative level, data collection and SLOs. Comments from the visiting pair emphasized the progress the College has made on SLOs and included the visitors' observation that the College is moving in a positive direction. Dr. Cochran expects the report mid-December. Then the Accrediting Commission meets in January and that body will review all materials to make the determination about our warning status.

1. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)

Susan Meacham reported that the Instructional Council met on November 16 and that these items were discussed:

Debbie Goodman reminded those present of the necessity to fill out an accident report form when any sort of accident occurs. These forms are available online and at the Wellness Center.

Jennifer McCandless spoke on SLO progress and asked deans to consider whether their administrative assistants can help in the SLO process.

Morris Rodrigue reported continued work on the hiring priorities procedures with respect to what data is included as various divisions request positions.

Emergency drills were discussed as one is scheduled this fall.

In Cabinet, top administration is working to formulate a comprehensive plan to deal with expected state budget reductions and to disseminate this plan.

Deans were given instructions on a format to use in revising degree requirements so that the format is consistent across divisions.

Dr. Cochran responded to a question about the Cabinet's determination of hiring priorities by saying that the Cabinet intends to present hiring priorities for all segments in the context of the College's approach to the reduced budget expected for next year.

c. Report from SLO Committee (Lenore Frigo and Jennifer McCandless)

The SLO Committee is researching best practices regarding comprehensive vs specific SLOs and regarding authentic assessment. The SLO Committee has also asked all representatives on that committee to name a "collector" from each division. The collector would be responsible for amassing data related to SLOs so that it can be entered as an annual report rather than each semester.

d. Report from College Council (Maureen Stephens)

College Council met November 18 and reviewed program review documents from the President's Office, Administrative Services, and Student Services. They also heard a report on the accreditation visit and continued work on the College's strategic plan

e. No reports from Curriculum Council, Matriculation Committee, or Scholastic Standards Committee.

5. Discussion/Action Items

a. SLO Subcommittee Bylaws: This is the **first reading**. (Jennifer McCandless/Lenore Frigo) (1 attachment)

At this first reading, the following suggestions were made: remove reference to representative from LRC and simply use "librarian"; remove "non voting members" and simply state that everyone is invited to attend SLO Committee meetings; remove reference to "voting members" from statement defining quorum; under section on "Meetings," use the term "SLO Coordinator" rather than "faculty co-chair." statement under meetings suggestion to use SLO coordinator instead of faculty co chair; and change the number of committee members to 14.

b. Credit By Examination: This is the **first reading**. The Matriculation Committee recommends we remove the 6-unit requirement in the current policy. (Kevin O'Rorke) (4 attachments)

The Matriculation Committee has recommended a change to the policy "Credit by Examination: For Articulated High School Courses and Programs." The change would remove the requirement that students necessarily accumulate six units prior to applying for credit by exam. The question arose whether students must pay for units earned through exams; however, Kevin O'Rorke suggested first dealing with the policy requirements and then looking at implementation implications. Executive Board members were reminded to discuss this recommendation with the members of their divisions.

c. Leadership Academy: A discussion. (Susan Meacham) (No attachments)

Susan Meacham brought to the Senate an item of concern from Instructional Council: in September, an Administrative Leadership Program was begun with three faculty members and four new managers as participants. This program was initiated and these participants were selected without the knowledge of either the Invest in Our People Committee or the Academic Senate, both of which carry responsibility for staff and faculty development. Susan raised two issues, one, asking how the faculty participants were chosen and whether participants were chosen in accordance with EEO standards, which raises legal questions, and two, whether it is appropriate that a faculty union officer be involved in such a program, where relationships may influence his ability to negotiate for faculty.

Dr. Cochran defended the Program by stating that Shasta College administration—and California community colleges in general—have been concerned about growing community college leadership from within. Workforce Development had created a very successful Leadership Excellence Program for community members, and Cabinet also wanted to offer such a program for College personnel. He asserted that the Administrative Leadership Program was a beta test and that, even if the process of inviting participants had been open and criteria for selection identified, some would have criticized why certain faculty and administrators were selected and others not.

Candace Byrne indicated that the Invest in Our People Committee, in addition to the concerns mentioned above about initiating the Program outside of the established shared governance structure and selecting participants with no regard for EEO standards, was also concerned that no classified staff were selected to participate.

Consensus of Senate Executive Board members was that there seemed something “sneaky” about the program and that such secrecy warrants concern.

Cathy Anderson summarized the Senate’s view in stating that such a leadership program is a good idea; however, it should be developed in a collaborative way with all segments of the College community involved in its design. The Senate therefore supports the Invest in Our People Committee’s efforts to revise the document laying out the details of the selection process and criteria, goals, curriculum, and end product of such a program

d. FW Grade: A discussion. Do we have to use it? How do we get the word out? Should instructors be using similar standards? (1 attachment)

Cathy Anderson requested Senate Executive Board members to take information about the FW grade back to divisions and assure they know that the FW grade is now available.

6. Other

Executive Board members saluted Brad Peters for the article on him in the Redding [Searchlight](#) and Craig Thompson for his coaching this fall of the football team. Also, Tom Orr was forgiven for the jarring interruption from his cell phone back in an October meeting; this forgiveness came in recognition of his penitent distribution of chocolates to Senate Executive Board members.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30. Next meeting: **Monday, December 8, 2008.**

