

Academic Senate
MINUTES
 Monday, December 9, 2013
 3:00 – 4:45 p.m.
 Room 1119

Executive Committee Members Present					
x	Cathy Anderson		Terry Bailey	x	Cristina Berriso
	Keith Brookshaw	x	Paul Calkins	x	David Cooper
	Kendall Crenshaw		Camilla Delsid		Richard Fiske
x	Leo Fong	x	Lenore Frigo	x	Scott Gordon
x	Robb Lightfoot		Sue Loring	x	Jennifer McCandless
	Robb McCandless	x	Susan Meacham		Ray Nicholas
x	Brad Peters		Carolyn Salus-Singh	x	Terrie Snow
x	Brian Spillane	x	Don Cingrani (N/V)		Ron Marley (N/V)
x	Meridith Randall (N/V)				
Other Faculty Present					
x	John Cicero	x	Thomas Martin	x	Lew Schmitt
x	Casey Schurig				
Guests					
x	Bill Breitbach	x	Sandra Hamilton Slane	x	Joe Wyse

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:04pm.

2. Approval of Minutes (Attachment)—November 25, 2013: Susan Meacham moved to approve the 11/25/13 minutes; seconded by Brian Spillane. 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. With the Board of Trustees meeting this Wednesday, Jennifer previewed what would be on the agenda. The Board will be approving the College calendar for 2014-2015; this will feature a 17-week semester, with a week off for Thanksgiving, the Spring semester starting a week later, and 11 flex days (2 mandated and 9 individual) for the entire year. With the expanded number of flex days, there will be greater flexibility with what qualifies as flex, so there will be more opportunities to gain flex credit. There would also be additional flex credit for flex day presenters. Meridith Randall fielded various question about the new calendar and flex schedule; Robb Lightfoot asked what the flex requirements were for those who teach overloads; Jennifer wondered about how sick days for adjunct faculty would be calculated. Meridith said she would discuss these matters with the Faculty Association. There was also a discussion about flex credit for adjuncts; because the new calendar is a week shorter, adjuncts will be paid a week's flex time in lieu of class time, so the new system would now allow adjuncts to get flex credit for activities such as attending department meetings. There were still questions and concerns about the role that Faculty Association played in approving the new calendar; David Cooper did not recall any campus-wide vote by faculty on this issue. Finally, there still remains the matter of how to handle finals week for the new calendar; this will need to be finalized by February. Jennifer said that she would add this item to the next agenda.
 - b. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
 - i. Instructional Council will be meeting this Thursday to discuss the prioritization of budget initiatives for next year.
 - c. Report from SLO Committee (Cathy Anderson)
 - i. The SLO Committee will be meeting this Thursday to finalize surveys for ISLOs.
 - d. Report from College Council (Cathy Anderson, Sue Loring)
 - i. No report.
 - e. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
 - i. No report.
 - f. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
 - i. No report.
 - 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. Discussion/Action Items

- a. Computer Literacy Requirement

- i. This conversation about the computer literacy requirement began last year when Doug Milhous proposed changes to the requirement because of curriculum changes. Several issues have come up during the course of this conversation. One involves the test that is one of the options available to satisfy the computer literacy requirement. There have been questions about whether this test is an effective and accurate measure of computer literacy, and this leads to the bigger issue of how we define computer literacy itself. There are many inconsistencies involving the expectations for what constitutes computer literacy. There are also questions about whether this requirement is mandated. Jennifer noted that the ACCJC standard only mentions that graduates need to be computer literate, but it doesn't specify what this involves, and there are no guidelines for how to measure this. Because of this vagueness, there was even the proposal to phase out the computer literacy requirement here at Shasta College. To help further the conversation about the requirement, Jennifer brought this matter to the Senate. Scott Gordon shared a 2009 study from the statewide Academic Senate that provided some background on why there is such ambiguity and inconsistency with the computer literacy requirement throughout the state; much of this is a result of a conflict between a recognition that computer literacy was an important set of skills for college graduates to possess and the concern that such a requirement would be an unfunded mandate for colleges to fulfill. He also cited a survey of California businesses that found 85.2% of California employers believed that computer literacy should be considered a basic skill for employment; another study found that women and minorities lag behind with computer literacy. These studies all highlight the importance of computer literacy, but colleges ultimately need to determine what skills constitute this and how best to achieve the goal of graduates possessing these skills. Tom Martin noted that Doug pushed for revising the computer literacy requirement as a result of one of the accreditation team's recommendations; Tom also acknowledged that many of our students have some degree of computer literacy, but they often lack professional skills in how they utilize technology; he suggested that one way to help build computer literacy is to have Shasta College meet one of its identified strategic goals by having at least 60% of its courses be web-enhanced. Scott shared the computer literacy test results from 2012; approximately 250 students took the test, and only 17 did not pass it. John Cicero and Tom Martin gave a quick sampling of specific skills that should be considered part of being computer literate; these involve both concept and application. Robb Lightfoot agreed that certain skills were necessary for computer literacy, but he emphasized the need to train students to be adaptable as technology evolves. Meridith Randall wanted to see ADT graduates meet established computer literacy requirements; she did a quick survey of what other colleges do to meet this and found that some require a 1-unit course, some embed the material in GE classes, and some use a test. Jennifer asked if the current test reflects and measures these essential skills.

Lew Schmitt explained that the former Computer Literacy Committee originally selected the questions on the exam, and a contracted company administers the test. Among CIS instructors, there are different opinions on the test as an effective measure of computer literacy. Scott recommended that that Computer Literacy Committee be re-formed to re-examine the computer literacy requirement. Others concurred with this. It was unclear what governance body the original committee was affiliated with. Scott acknowledged that the committee's work would need to be ongoing to continually update what the requirements need to be, but there was debate on whether this committee should be a standing subcommittee of the Senate, or an ad hoc subcommittee; it was agreed that initially it could be an ad hoc subcommittee that would report to the Senate. David Cooper moved that Scott Gordon form a Computer Literacy Committee as an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate to determine the history of the previous iteration of the committee, re-examine the computer literacy requirement and bring back to the Senate its recommendations; seconded by Cathy Anderson. Motion carried. Scott mentioned that he would inform Senate members of the committee's meeting times.

- b. New Course Approvals—from Curriculum Council (Attachment)
 - i. The first five courses listed (ADJU 45 Criminal Street Gangs; ADJU 46 Narcotic and Drug Abuse; AUTO 176 Level 2 Smog Technician Training; FIRS 177 Fire Prevention; PHIL 14 Modern Western Philosophy) were approved at the last Curriculum Council meeting, and the remaining two courses (MATH 2A Precalculus College Algebra; MATH 2B Precalculus Trigonometry) were approved afterwards by e-mail. All these courses were created to align with C-ID. Lenore Frigo moved to approve these courses; seconded by David Cooper. Motion carried.
- c. Succession Planning
 - i. This issue came out of Beth Smith's talk during our Senate retreat earlier in the semester and from Jennifer's inquiries about how other faculty senates operate. There are different options available to set up a system for determining succession for Senate officers. One possibility would be to have a president-elect, and if so, some changes will need to be incorporated into the bylaws. Jennifer asked for any suggestions. She described how difficult it was to learn the job, so she hoped that future presidents would have a transitional period to prepare and be mentored by the current president. She asked if there should be an ad hoc subcommittee formed to study this matter and make recommendations. Cathy Anderson questioned the potential benefits of such a plan for succession; she didn't see this as necessarily making the task of finding a new president easier because it still ultimately comes down to someone willing to take on the job. Jennifer acknowledged this challenge, but she wanted a system in place that would ensure that people become more vested in the Senate. Lenore Frigo, Scott Gordon and Robb Lightfoot volunteered to serve on this ad hoc subcommittee. Robb suggested researching what comparable institutions do and identify best practices. Jennifer wanted to have the ad hoc subcommittee make recommendations by March to allow time for any changes to the bylaws to be made before the next elections for Senate officers. Scott Gordon moved to form an ad hoc subcommittee to study and make

recommendations on succession planning and possible changes to the bylaws; seconded by Susan Meacham. Motion carried.

- d. Excellent Educator and Hayward Awards
 - i. Continuing the discussion on how best to adapt our Excellent Educator Awards to the new Hayward Award practice of alternating annually between full-time and part-time faculty, Jennifer posed two questions: 1) Do we want two Excellent Educator Awards, one for full-time and one for part-time, every year? 2) Do we still want to vote on the Excellent Educator Award during the spring semester? Because of the tight deadline imposed this year, it was agreed that we would not be able to select a part-time instructor to forward for Hayward consideration at this point in time, but there was no consensus reached on a procedure to determine which Excellent Educator Award winner would be selected for Hayward consideration. Susan Meacham suggested that we extend this discussion into our next meeting to allow for more input.
 - e. Ad hoc Committee to work on Scholastic Standards' course waiver procedure (AP5140 Attached)
 - i. As discussed during the last Senate meeting, this ad hoc committee was recommended to examine current policies for course substitutions and waivers and to make recommendations on any changes if needed. There was discussion about who would be on this committee and what their specific charge would be. Because the meeting time expired, it was agreed that we would continue this discussion with our next meeting.
6. Other?
 7. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.
 8. Next meeting: Monday, January 27 at 3:00pm