

**Academic Senate  
MINUTES**

Monday, October 28, 2013

3:00 – 4:45 p.m.

Room 1119

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

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:03pm.
2. Approval of Minutes (Attachment)—October 14, 2013: Paul Calkins moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Terry Bailey. 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. No report.
  - b. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
    - i. No report.
  - c. Report from SLO Committee (Cathy Anderson)
    - i. No report.
  - d. Report from College Council (Cathy Anderson, Sue Loring)
    - i. At their last meeting, College Council finalized the questions to be used in the survey on the planning process, and they conducted readings of APs and BPs that were revised. There also was a conversation about ways to educate people about the Participatory Governance Manual.
  - e. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
    - i. No report.
  - f. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
    - i. Teresa previewed the Student Athlete Success Program that would be starting up on November 18. The newly hired Student Athlete Success Coach is an assistant coach for the football team, Tim Patterson, and he will be available for 19 hours each week in the 700 building; his primary job is to monitor student athlete tutoring participation and academic progress. Teresa also spoke of the Math Academy, which is planned for August 2014, and it is geared towards recruiting students who place into basic skills level math courses and putting them through a week-long review and teaching session before they re-take the math placement test, with the goal of having at least 25% of students place one level higher in their placement.
  - g. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee as needed (Don Cingrani)
    - i. No report.
  - h. Report from Textbook Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
    - i. No report.
  - i. Report from Distance Education Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
    - i. No report.
  
5. Informational Items
  - a. Student Success Committee bylaws and membership
    - i. Teresa Doyle presented the latest draft of the bylaws for the Student Success Committee. She pointed out the most recent revisions that were made: Added clarification on how members are recruited, and how representatives would be replaced. Also added was item 6 in Article IV: "All recommendations of the Student Success Committee related to student support matters will be forwarded to the Student Services Council for approval."

6. Discussion/Action items

- a. AP 5055: Registration Priorities (e-mail Attachment from Timothy Johnston) – Second Reading
  - i. Sue Loring noted that the attachment in Jennifer’s e-mail was not the latest version of AP 5055, so she shared the latest one, which added this explanation for the registration priority: “To register in Blocks 1-4, students cannot be on probation for two consecutive semesters (Title 5, section 55031). Returning students and students who began taking classes at Shasta College after Summer 2014 must also have a comprehensive education plan on file by the end of their 3<sup>rd</sup> semester.” For clarification, registration start dates were also added for each of the individual blocks. Non-matriculated students were moved from Block 6 to Block 8 to encourage students to attend orientation. Marc Beam recommended adding a definition of what qualifies as an academic term and what qualifies as a semester, because a summer term is not considered equivalent to a semester. Cathy Anderson moved to approve the revisions to AP 5055 with the added definitions of an academic term and semester; seconded by David Cooper. Motion carried.
- b. AP 7210: Faculty Hiring Procedures (Attachment)– Second Reading
  - i. Screening Rubric (Attachment)
  - ii. Screening Rubric Criteria (Attachment)
    1. During discussion of AP 7210, Terrie Snow expressed concern about the October 15 deadline because programs can potentially be put in jeopardy if a faculty member announces retirement after that date. CTE programs are particularly vulnerable; she believed the phrase “may recommend that the position(s) be replaced” in Item 2 of the Hiring Priorities Timeline was too open-ended; in particular, the word “may” is too ambiguous and does not require the division dean to make a request for a replacement. Meridith Randall explained that the October 15 deadline was intended to coincide with the start of the annual hiring season, and the revisions to the AP were geared to address concerns about how late retirement announcements are handled. Scott Gordon moved to approve AP 7210; seconded by Robb Lightfoot. Motion carried with one nay vote.
    2. Discussion of the Screening Rubric and Rubric Criteria was postponed until next meeting. Meridith added that because the hiring request and prioritization process is already underway right now, any changes made to the AP and the Screening Rubric and Rubric Criteria would not apply until next year.
- c. Planning Process Feedback (e-mail attachment from Sue Loring)
  - i. This item comes from College Council, and it’s part of fulfilling ACCJC’s requirement for continuous improvement with the planning cycle. This past spring, there was a survey that was sent out college-wide; several major themes from the survey responses were identified, and four questions were developed focusing on these themes: 1) How widespread was participation in the process? How can we increase participation? 2) Does the planning timeline need to be adjusted? If so, in what way(s)? 3) Does the rubric serve as an effective tool in the prioritization of initiatives? If not, what would you change? 4) How can we improve the planning process? Sue Loring had sent out these questions earlier

by e-mail, but she wanted to bring them to Senate for any additional input. For Question 1, there was concern about the low participation rate of adjunct faculty, but Scott Gordon pointed out that it's very difficult to gauge the level of involvement that adjunct faculty desire because they are such a diverse group. There were no responses to Sue's e-mail, and there didn't seem to be any complaints about opportunities for participation, but there was a general consensus that more needed to be done to increase adjunct involvement in the planning process. Marc Beam floated the idea of using TracDat as a means of drawing in adjunct participation by encouraging on-line interaction rather than in-person meetings. For Question 2, David Cooper complained that too many deadlines came in October. Many believed that October was too early to assess progress because the fiscal/academic year has just started, and the budget situation for the following year is still unclear. Meridith noted that some colleges do initiative requests in the fall and then completing the area plans in the spring, and this seems to be a more sensible approach than doing both in the fall. The general consensus was that some planning deadlines could be pushed beyond October. David also questioned tying course-level SLO results to budget initiatives in Area Plans; SLOs were not designed with budgeting concerns in mind. Meridith acknowledged that SLOs are more directly linked to pedagogy, but she emphasized that how we budget needs to be guided by what benefits student learning, and SLOs can be used to measure this. Cathy Anderson pointed out that resource requests need to be tied to data, but the data do not necessarily need to be specifically SLO data. For Question 3, Sue asked about the usefulness of the Resource Allocation Rubric. Robb Lightfoot expressed concern that because the rubric identifies a fairly specific set of criteria that will be applied to make decisions on resource allocation, this would have the general effect of discouraging any resource requests that don't necessarily match up with the exiting criteria. Scott Gordon gave as an example a resource request that was geared more towards student achievement and not directly measurable with an SLO; he believed that the rubric would need to be expanded to accommodate such cases. Cathy suggested the possibility of expanding beyond SLO data as primary support for resource requests.

- d. Visibility of SLO results in TracDat for PLOs and ISLOs
  - i. Marc Beam explained how course-level SLO data could be summarized in TracDat at the program level, such as with PLOs, ISLOs and Area Plans. This was piloted in OAS. Marc brought in a PLO report that displayed course-level SLO results for individual sections of a course; this was possible because OAS faculty agreed to make SLO results visible at the program level and clicked a box in TracDat allowing this. Paul Calkins asked if it would be possible to allow department faculty to decide for themselves if course-level SLO data would be visible in PLO reports. Marc stated that TracDat can be set up to do this, but he was concerned that having some departments agree to make their SLO data visible but other not would compromise the importance of linking data in the process of institutional planning. Right now, the box to allow for SLO data to be visible at the program level is available at the course level but not the section level, so if the box is checked for a specific course, it would apply to all sections of that course. So the decision to check or not check the box would need to be made on the department level. Time limitations forced continuation to next

meeting, so area representatives will need to get feedback from their constituents on this matter.

- e. Faculty Evaluation Feedback (PowerPoint attachment)
  - i. Ways to get feedback from Senate to Faculty Association
    - 1. Because of time limitations, Sue recommended that any feedback could be sent to Anthony Eckhardt.
- 7. Other?
- 8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:54pm.
- 9. Next meeting: Monday, November 25, 2013 at 3:00pm