

**Academic Senate
MINUTES**

Monday, February 24, 2014
3:00 – 4:45 p.m.
Room 1120

Executive Committee Members Present					
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Cristina Berriso		Keith Brookshaw
x	Paul Calkins		David Cooper	x	Kendall Crenshaw
	Camilla Delsid	x	Richard Fiske	x	Leo Fong
x	Lenore Frigo	x	Scott Gordon		Robb Lightfoot
x	Sue Loring	x	Jennifer McCandless		Rob McCandless
x	Susan Meacham	x	Ray Nicholas	x	Brad Peters
x	Mark Rakowsky	x	Carolyn Salus-Singh	x	Terrie Snow
x	Brian Spillane	x	Craig Thompson	x	Don Cingrani (N/V)
x	Ron Marley (N/V)	x	Meridith Randall (N/V)		
Other Faculty Present					
x	Marc Beam	x	Teresa Doyle	x	Heather Wylie
Guests					
x	Will Breitbach	x	Dan Haskins	x	Frank Nigro

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:01pm.
2. Approval of Minutes (Attachment)—February 10, 2014: Susan Meacham moved to approve the 2/10/14 minutes; seconded by Craig Thompson. Motion carried with one abstention.

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. The ISLO surveys are now ready to be given. Initially, the SLO Committee looked into existing surveys that would have cost the College around \$12,000 to \$15,000; instead, the committee created these seven surveys, one for each ISLO. A certain number of classes were randomly selected to give each survey, and no single class would have more than one survey. Deans will contact the instructors of those classes. Each survey was designed to take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Cathy referred to an e-mail sent out by Joe Wyse reminding faculty that they can opt out of the survey if it is a hardship, but if instructors opt out, they need to inform their deans about this so that alternate classes can be given the survey. Marc Beam described what the survey packet will include—a cover sheet with instructions for the instructor and a survey sheet for each student. Cathy encouraged instructors to look through the survey questions and suggest any modifications.
 - d. Report from College Council (Cathy Anderson, Sue Loring)
 - i. College Council has been working on the Mission Statement, incorporating the changes suggested in feedback that it has received. The subcommittee overseeing this also looked at ACCJC standards for mission statements, and they discovered several required elements that our Mission Statement lacked. Also discussed were the prioritized initiatives; this year, classified staff position requests were taken out of the full list of prioritized initiatives and treated as a separate list.
 - e. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
 - i. Ron reported that Curriculum Council is working on bylaws and clearing out last year's backlog.
 - f. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
 - i. No report. Next meeting will be Thursday.
 - g. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee as needed (Don Cingrani)
 - i. Don reported that they are still trying to fill the ad hoc subcommittee on course waivers.
 - h. Report from Textbook Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
 - i. No report.
 - i. Report from Distance Education Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
 - i. Will Breitbach announced the new student portal for online courses (SC Online); it was designed to be more student-friendly. The DE Committee will conduct

tests to gauge its effectiveness. There's also a new faculty portal with improved features.

5. Informational Items

a. Report from Center for Community Engagement – Heather Wylie

- i. Heather provided an update on the current status of the SCCCE. 1) The Center is now under Academic Affairs. 2) Recently there was an e-mail sent to survey our students about their interest in and involvement with community engagement; Shasta College was chosen as one of four community colleges in California to pilot this survey. 3) The Student Leadership Fellows Program is now in its fourth semester; students in this program are matched with a community partner and typically work with youth in the community. The program is looking for students from all backgrounds and disciplines. There are 25 fellows this semester, meeting once a week. So far, five fellows have been offered jobs by the partners they've been working with. Also, because more of the CSUs are requiring some type of service learning as part of their graduation requirements, programs like this are growing. In about a month Heather will be sending out information on the program for this coming fall. 4) The Campus Safe Zone program training is coming up this week; this is part of a state-funded program to train faculty and staff to be an ally for the LGBT student community; a campus awareness campaign on this will be done in the fall. 5) The SCCCE Presents Series is featuring a talk by Dr. Mukesh Kapila tomorrow evening. 6) The SCCCE is exploring the possibility of course designations put in the catalog identifying courses with a service learning component. There's also the possibility of flex credit for faculty involved with this. 7) In December, the SCCCE received a grant to study what civic engagement means here at Shasta College, especially the opportunities for this involving worksite learning, service learning, internships, volunteering, etc. Terrie Snow asked about background checks for fellows who work with youth in the community. Heather explained that this depends on the partner organization's own policies, but all fellows who work with children are supervised when doing so. Jennifer suggested looking into tutors here on campus being involved with community engagement projects.

b. Excellent Educators – nominations and selection process

- i. There are two nominees for the full-time award (Larry Grandy and Heather Wylie), and two nominees for the part-time award (Melinda Kashuba and Kylee Duran-Cox). This afternoon Susan e-mailed the supporting documentation for all the nominations. Everyone should read these and be prepared to vote on the candidates during our next meeting.

6. Discussion/Action items

a. AP/BP 4020 – Program and Curriculum Development (Attachments)

- i. There is a subcommittee of College Council that is currently looking at program review. The part of AP 4020 involving developing new programs is under the purview of Senate, so Jennifer wanted us to review this. Frank Nigro explained that the PIC committee's responsibilities are described from page 3 onward in AP 4020; he noted that PIC has discussed the first two pages of the AP and decided that the committee in its present form could not take on the task of approving new programs. When the PIC committee met with Jennifer, Ron

Marley, Ray Nicholas, Heather Wylie and Roger Gerard, they were all able to study this first section of AP 4020, and they concluded that the process detailed in the first two pages was a good one; however, they were not sure if new programs being developed were even going through these steps for approval. Frank also pointed out that the AP and BP don't entirely match up, so the BP would need to be revised so that both are consistent. The main question now is whether we should scrap the existing process and start over, or revise it. Ron Marley argued for simplifying the process by consolidating the forms for new programs and program review to just one document. Scott Gordon agreed that the process needs to be made more streamlined because with the push to create ADTs, there has been an expansion of programs, which ultimately results in more and more program reviews needing to be done. Jennifer asked all to bring feedback from their constituents; this would be especially important for divisions with many programs.

b. Faculty Professional Development

- i. With the new flex calendar going into effect this fall, there have been many questions about ways to get flex credit. In the past, flex had to be outside of regularly scheduled workdays, so typically only evenings and weekends would qualify. This is no longer the case. Now, flex time can be counted if it's simply outside of the hours for normal faculty obligations (class and office hours). There will also be many more opportunities for flex credit. Jennifer pointed to a book entitled *Guidelines for Implementation of the Flexible Calendar Program* that was put out by the Faculty Development Committee of the statewide Academic Senate; she emphasized how this book will be a useful guide to help us develop our own flex program. Jennifer met with Teresa Doyle and Cathy Anderson on how to manage faculty development. One recommendation that emerged from their discussion is to form a standing subcommittee geared exclusively towards faculty professional development; this has been tentatively called the Faculty Professional Development Committee. This subcommittee would be distinct from the Professional Development Committee, the joint committee that covers all three constituent groups of faculty, administrators and classified staff, and has traditionally overseen our campus-wide flex days. Teresa, Roger Gerard and Shelley Presnell are the faculty representatives on the Professional Development Committee, and Jennifer believed that they should also serve on this new Senate subcommittee. To sum up the new flex schedule, Jennifer explained that along with the 2 mandatory flex days (12 hours), there will be up to 2 days that can be devoted to SLO and/or Area Plan/Program Review work (12 hours), and there are 7 additional days of flex (42 hours) that would need to be fulfilled. According to the *Guidelines for Implementation of the Flexible Calendar Program*, the main categories of activities that qualify for flex are staff improvement, student improvement and instructional improvement, and there are nine in total that are approved by the Chancellor's Office; this is a fairly large umbrella that would include many different activities available to faculty. To give us a better sense of this wide range of possibilities, Jennifer distributed a handout from El Camino College listing flex options available to their faculty; this list could give us ideas about the types of activities that we would want available for flex credit here. Teresa mentioned that the deans will be surveying their faculty to determine activities that could be used

for flex, and the Faculty Professional Development Committee will work on determining which approved categories these fall under. As for the committee structure that oversees flex, she went on to explain that some colleges around the state have the faculty professional development committee be a subcommittee of the campus-wide professional development committee, but others have it as a subcommittee of the academic senate, so both options are available, but when they met, Teresa, Jennifer and Cathy agreed that for Shasta College the latter made the most sense. Teresa said that they envisioned the Faculty Professional Development Committee as communicating with division deans and department coordinators to identify the flex needs of their faculty. Cathy added that some activities involving learning outcomes could qualify as flex activities because they fall under professional development. Also, because the role of the SLO Committee will be more and more geared towards professional development, she suggested that the SLO Committee be re-designated as a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Professional Development Committee, much like the GE Committee is a standing subcommittee of the Curriculum Council. Teresa added that the Faculty Professional Development Committee would have representatives from each division. There were questions raised about the scope of the committee's responsibilities; Terrie Snow asked if the committee would handle the approval of individual flex requests. Teresa, Jennifer and Cathy acknowledged that the specific duties of the subcommittee would need to be clearly defined during its formation, but there's also an urgency to form this subcommittee as quickly as possible to implement a system to handle professional development and flex beginning in the fall. Meredith mentioned that who approves individual flex requests and how these requests are approved would be determined by faculty, but HR would still need to handle the documentation for flex to be able to meet and maintain requirements set by the Chancellor's Office. She also added that a good rule of thumb is that anything outside of contractual duties that contributes to student improvement, instructional improvement and staff improvement could qualify as flex. Jennifer asked Senate reps to talk to their constituents about this subcommittee model and what activities could be added to the list of flex options.

- c. Block scheduling of GE courses
 - i. Because there's currently a movement to make 3-unit classes meet twice a week to make scheduling more uniform, and many students have expressed a preference for classes to meet fewer times per week, Jennifer believed that faculty need to discuss this practice. Meredith explained that this movement originated from GE faculty asking for block scheduling. Also, if we do go to a compressed 16-week calendar in the future, we would need to rely heavily on block scheduling to allow for that. However, she understood that there needs to be more research on the pedagogical effects of having longer class meetings fewer times each week versus shorter class meetings spread out more frequently over the week; these effects will likely differ from discipline to discipline—Jennifer noted that students in her math classes have told her that they find meeting more often during the week much more conducive to learning; Richard Fiske mentioned how essential it is for courses in the arts to have frequent class meetings because these allow for more rehearsal time;

Meridith acknowledged that the same could be also said for foreign languages). There also needs to be more input from students on what works best. Don Cingrani expressed concern about the shortage of classrooms that would come with a block schedule. Meridith agreed that classroom scheduling could be complicated, but she also noted that the current system does not utilize classrooms very efficiently either. For now, only GE classes would be affected by block scheduling; faculty in other disciplines can determine for themselves which scheduling model works best for them. Ray Nicholas urged getting input from counselors because they help students complete their class schedules.

d. Peer Evaluators

Part-Time Instructor	Discipline	Proposed Peer Evaluator
Christie Higgins	ART	Andrew Petterson-Tutschka
Misty Rutledge	ECE	Kate Ashbey
Jackie Westphal	HUM	Kate Ashbey

- i. This request for approval of peer evaluators came from an e-mail sent by Caryn Bailey. These peer evaluators are tenure-track and not tenured, so they need to be approved by the Senate. Cathy Anderson moved approval of these peer evaluators; seconded by Brian Spillane. Several raised concerns about tenure-track faculty members asked to do peer evaluations; Frank Nigro noted that the district contract stipulates that first-year tenure-track faculty are not expected to do peer evaluations. There was also a question of Kate Ashbey, who is an ECE instructor, doing an evaluation of an instructor in Humanities. Cathy Anderson and Brian Spillane withdrew their motion. Jennifer stated that she would ask Caryn for more details about this.

7. Other?

- a. Terrie Snow was concerned about a statewide movement that would allow community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees. SB 850 is the specific legislation currently being considered. Jennifer said that she would put this on the agenda for our next meeting.

8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm.

9. Next meeting: Monday, March 10 at 3pm.