

**Academic Senate
MINUTES**

Monday, October 14, 2013

3:00 – 4:45 p.m.

Room 1119

| Executive Committee Members Present | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------------|
| x | Cathy Anderson | x | Terry Bailey | | Keith Brookshaw |
| x | Paul Calkins | x | David Cooper | | Kendall Crenshaw |
| | Camilla Delsid | x | Richard Fiske | x | Leo Fong |
| x | Lenore Frigo | x | Scott Gordon | x | Robb Lightfoot |
| | Sue Loring | x | Jennifer McCandless | | Rob McCandless |
| x | Susan Meacham | x | Ray Nicholas | x | Brad Peters |
| x | Carolyn Salus-Singh | x | Terrie Snow | x | Brian Spillane |
| | Chuck Spotts | x | Don Cingrani (N/V) | | Ron Marley (N/V) |
| x | Meridith Randall (N/V) | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Other Faculty Present | | | | | |
| x | Teresa Doyle | x | Karen Henderson | | |
| Guests | | | | | |
| x | William Breitbach | x | Tim Johnston | | |
| x | Frank Nigro | x | Tom Orr | | |

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:27pm.
2. Approval of Minutes from September 23, 2013 Meeting (Attachment): Terry Bailey moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Susan Meacham. Motion carried.

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.

4. Report
 - a. Report from Senate President (Jennifer McCandless)
 - i. Senate Retreat—Jennifer thanked everyone who was able to attend the Senate retreat on September 30. She hopes that this type of informal gathering will continue in the future, preferably off campus. She pointed out a few items in ASCCC President Beth Smith’s recent *Rostrum* article that reinforced what Beth spoke about in person during the retreat; these included the roles of community college faculty and the concept of academic freedom. Jennifer also reiterated Beth’s account of the different attacks on General Education and how the Academic Senate is advocating for the significance of General Education. Jennifer concluded by echoing Beth’s statement on the importance of using the statewide resolutions process to get any proposals we might have to be recognized on the state level.
 - b. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
 - i. Instructional Council met on October 3 and examined the responses to CurricuNet training, which were generally very positive. Meridith Randall noted that just about all faculty have completed this training, with one more session still to be held. The Area Plans and Program Reviews that are currently underway were also discussed; in particular, the issue of mapping course level SLO results data and whether deans should be able to see these results in the Area Plans and Program Reviews was debated. On the question of whether faculty within a division or department could choose to link or not link their SLO results data, there were varied responses; some division deans reported that their faculty members had no objections to administrators seeing the SLO results data. Meridith requested that Senate members bring this question back to their constituents: Should faculty within a division or department have the choice to link or not link to their SLO data in their Area Plans and Program Reviews, or should there be a single policy that all divisions will follow? Meridith also announced that the staffing requests and faculty hiring priorities deadline was moved back to October 28; the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee will be meeting in early November to review these requests. Tim Johnston brought in drafts of new forms to be used for petitioning for course repetition and reinstatement for priority registration; these will come to the Senate at a later date.
 - c. Report from SLO Committee (Cathy Anderson)
 - i. In response to the low scores that we received for PLOs and ISLOs in the ACCJC follow-up report, the SLO Committee focused their attention on ways to improve the scores in these areas. Because GELOs are PLOs for the University Studies Degree and the General Studies Degree, Cathy talked to the General Education Committee about taking on the responsibilities for GELOs, and the GE Committee agreed to do so. Additionally, the spring flex day will be devoted to

GELOs, and the hope is to invite Beth Smith back to speak on General Education for this. For ISLOs Cathy reported that Marc Beam presented several possible survey tools that could be used for indirect and direct measures for ISLOs, but these were rejected as either too time consuming or expensive. So instead the committee came up with seven surveys, one for each of the seven ISLOs, that would each take 5 to 10 minutes; these would be given randomly so that one out of seven classes would be surveyed. Also the committee discussed the question of SLO data being used in Area Plans, Program Reviews, PLOs and ISLOs, and as a result the committee wants an MOU specifying that SLO data cannot be used in any way to evaluate instructors. Cathy believed that this would make faculty feel safer when they link their SLO data to ISLOs. Cathy asked if this would be an approach that faculty would support. There were clearly many concerns about how SLO data could potentially be used; in particular there was worry about SLO data being disseminated and applied beyond ISLOs, Area Plans and Program Reviews. Questions that were raised: How should the MOU be worded? Should it narrowly define how SLO data can be used? This matter will be put on the agenda for the next Senate meeting, so Jennifer asked everyone to get input from their constituents. Lenore Frigo suggested that we see an example of how SLO data would actually be reported in order to give us a better idea of what we should specify in the MOU; Cathy said that she would ask Marc Beam about providing an example.

- d. Report from College Council (Cathy Anderson, Sue Loring)
 - i. Jennifer reported that the Strategic Plan activity update was sent out. Also, a task force has been formed to evaluate how the planning process is operating, so College Council will be approaching individual divisions and departments, as well as the Senate, for feedback on this.
- e. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
 - i. No report.
- f. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
 - i. Teresa reported that the committee is continuing revisions to their bylaws by incorporating changes that were suggested during the last Senate meeting. She will bring the next draft to the October 28 Senate meeting for a second reading.
- g. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee as needed (Don Cingrani)
 - i. No report.
- h. Report from Textbook Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
 - i. Jennifer mentioned that at the last Board of Trustees meeting Scott Thompson praised the Teresa Poore grants for textbooks.
- i. Report from Distance Education Committee as needed
 - i. Tom Orr announced that he's stepping down as administrative co-chair, and William Breitbach will now take over that role. Carolyn Singh is a member of this committee, and she will be able to provide reports during future Senate meetings. Tom reported that the DE Committee has revised their bylaws, and the overall membership of the committee has been reduced to make it more manageable. Cathy Anderson asked if the Senate needs to approve of the changes to the bylaws of a joint committee. Jennifer checked, and the Senate bylaws do not require this; this would be considered an informational item. In conclusion, the Senate thanked Tom for his dedicated service and hard work as co-chair of the committee.

5. Informational Items

a. Basic Skills Year End Report and Action Plan (Attachment)

- i. Frank Nigro and Teresa Doyle presented a review of this annual report for the Basic Skills Initiative. They highlighted the major components of the report: expenditures, action plans (including the Student Athlete Success Program and the Math Academy), and success rates. At this stage in the Basic Skills Initiative, the Chancellor's Office is now getting colleges to identify what has been successful and to focus on growing these programs.

6. Discussion/Action items

a. AP 7210: Faculty Hiring Procedures (Attachment)

- i. Jennifer explained that an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate, along with Meredith Randall and Marc Beam, worked on these revisions. The subcommittee added a statement in section 1.b specifying the use of the Hiring Priorities Screening Rubric to create the initial prioritized hiring list, and although the rubric itself is not part of the AP, the subcommittee made recommendations for changing some of the criteria in the rubric to make the language less ambiguous and open-ended. She distributed a copy of these suggested changes. Jennifer then pointed out the specific changes that were made to the AP: 1) An additional faculty member is in the committee membership list; 2) No distinction is made now between new positions and replacement positions, and the prioritized hiring list will not be carried over from year to year; 3) Clarification of the procedure to be used when additional replacement positions are requested and a re-prioritizing of the entire list is needed. This was to be considered as a first reading. Jennifer stated that she would e-mail everyone both the earlier version of the Hiring Priorities Screening Rubric and the revised version. She asked that everyone share it with their constituents to get their feedback. Lenore Frigo suggested specifying that the rubric cannot be changed after the deans present their requests to the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee, thus ensuring that the committee would be uniformly using the correct rubric. She also questioned the elimination of criterion #5 in the earlier version of the rubric ("Quantity of Program Taught by Adjuncts and Overload"). Jennifer explained that this was moved to criterion #3 of the revised version ("Insufficient Number of Full-Time Faculty"). Several objected to this, pointing out that the two are not equivalent. Jennifer suggested that we could discuss this during our next meeting.

b. BP 5010: Admissions and Concurrent Enrollment (Attachment)

- i. Tim Johnston explained that the revision to this BP was legislatively mandated, reflecting a change to the Ed. Code. This revision allows Shasta College to deny or restrict enrollment to students who were expelled from or at risk of expulsion from another community college. Jennifer stated that because the revision was mandated because of changes in the Ed. Code we would treat this as a second reading. Scott Gordon moved to approve the revisions to BP 5010; seconded by Cathy Anderson. David Cooper asked about the wording of the first paragraph that was added; he wanted to know if the "and" was necessary in the statement specifying the conditions under which a student's enrollment may be denied: "...the applicant has been expelled within the preceding five years or is

undergoing expulsion procedures in another California community college district, **and** that the applicant continues to present a danger to the physical safety of the students and employees of the District.” Should the “and” be changed to an “or”? Tim explained that this was the language that currently exists in the Ed. Code, and it reflects the need to ensure due process. Brian Spillane concurred that the language would have been vetted by legal counsel and the “and” is deliberate. Don Cingrani asked if the AP that corresponds to this BP would go into more detail about how this policy would be implemented. Tim said there were no changes planned for the AP at this time; the BP would need to be approved first before any changes could be made to the AP. Tom Orr pointed out that the main objective of this BP change is to allow for the sharing of information between schools on any student who has been expelled and has a record of behavior that could be considered dangerous. A vote was called, and the motion carried.

- c. AP 5055: Registration Priorities (Attachment)
 - i. Tim Johnston explained that this revision was in response to the Student Success Act’s requirement that college districts have registration priorities in place by Fall 2014. He noted that there is a distinction between priorities that are mandated by Ed. Code and priorities that are left to the district’s discretion. The items in this AP that have an Ed. Code citation are legally mandated, but items that don’t have an Ed. Code number are based on district discretion. He pointed out that one of the most significant additions to this list of registration priorities was the consideration of non-matriculated students. Because there were changes here that were not mandated to comply with Ed. Code, Jennifer requested that we treat this as a first reading; we will do a second reading and vote on it during the next meeting.
 - d. Succession Planning
 - i. Because the meeting time ran longer, this item would be on the next agenda.
7. Other?
8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:57pm.
9. Next meeting: Monday, October 28 at 3:00 pm.