

**Academic Senate**  
**MINUTES**  
 Monday, August 24, 2015  
 3:00 – 4:45 p.m.  
 Room 1107

| <b>Executive Committee Members Present</b> |                     |   |                     |   |                        |
|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------------------|
| x  | Cathy Anderson      |   | Mark Blaser         |   | Keith Brookshaw        |
|  | Toni Cancilla       | x | James Crockett      | x | Richard Fiske          |
| x  | Leo Fong            | x | Keith Foust         | x | Scott Gordon           |
|  | Debra Griffin       | x | Karen Henderson     | x | Robb Lightfoot         |
| x  | Jennifer McCandless | x | Susan Meacham       | x | Ray Nicholas           |
|  | Nancy Roback        | x | Carolyn Salus-Singh | x | Iraja Sivadas          |
| x  | Brian Spillane      | x | Linda Thomas        |   | Craig Thompson         |
| x  | Joanne Tippin       | x | Andrea Williams     |   |                        |
|  | Don Cingrani (N/V)  |   | Ron Marley (N/V)    | x | Meridith Randall (N/V) |
|  |                     |   |                     |   |                        |
| <b>Other Faculty Present</b>               |                     |   |                     |   |                        |
| x  | Carolyn Borg        | x | David Cooper        | x | Lenore Frigo           |
| <b>Guests</b>                              |                     |   |                     |   |                        |
| x  | Will Breitbach      | x | James Crandall      | x | Tim Johnston           |
|  |                     |   |                     |   |                        |

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:01pm.
2. Approval of Minutes (Attachments)— August 24, 2015 and September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2015:

- a. Linda Thomas moved to approve the minutes from the August 24 and September 14, 2015, meetings; 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 Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
      - i. At its last meeting, Instructional Council was given an introduction to Tableau, a web-based data interface system; there were also the following items on the agenda: Discussion of the summary report from the visiting Institutional Effectiveness team and the follow-up to these recommendations; a need for AP4020 to be revised, and this will require input from Academic Senate in review of programs; an update from the Faculty Instructional Technology (FIT) Committee.
    - b. Report from Curriculum Council as needed (Ron Marley)
      - i. No report. Meridith Randall announced that the new Curriculum handbook will be vetted by the committee at its next meeting.
    - c. Report from FEC Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
      - i. No report.
    - d. Report from Student Success Committee as needed (Teresa Doyle)
      - i. Jennifer McCandless noted that the committee will be looking to revise the early alert system; counseling has found that fewer and fewer faculty have been using these alerts. Because there is more flexibility now from an IT perspective, the procedure can be modified to make it more efficient and effective.
    - e. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee as needed (Don Cingrani)
      - i. No report.
    - f. Report from Textbook Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
      - i. No report.
    - g. Report from Distance Education Committee as needed (Carolyn Singh)
      - i. No report. Next committee meeting will be this Wednesday.
    - h. Report from College Council (Robb Lightfoot)—see website
    - i. Report from Senate President (Robb Lightfoot)—see website
5. Informational Items
    - a. Chancellor's Office Releases & Announcements – see website (Text Talk Matters-Mental Health Meeting on Oct 6<sup>th</sup>, Sustainability Winners named, California Apprenticeship Initiative – see website
    - b. ASCCC Releases & Announcements – see website (Board of Gov. Award nominations due, Instructional Design/Innovation proposals due by 9/28, BA Taskforce Listserv, Regional Curriculum Meetings 11/13 & 11/14 – see website
    - c. Accreditation Standards as of June 2014 – see website
    - d. National Network for Educational Renewal – Chico, 10/1-3 <http://bit.ly/1FzWfnm>
    - e. Volunteer(s) needed for SSP Equity Conference Oct 1 & 2 – See website
    - f. Volunteer needed for Cooke Foundation Scholarship Committee - attachment

- g. BA program update – Status of curriculum – see website
  - h. Tableau Reader – data interface/report generator – Demonstration, James Crandall
    - i. James Crandall explained that Tableau is intended to be used for annual area plans and program reviews, and he demonstrated how to navigate and search with it. He requested that users notify him of any errors or problems they spot.
  - i. Save the date, faculty adoption appreciation /bookstore event 10/13 (no, faculty are not up for adoption...)
  - j. Shasta's CI-D course status – attachment
    - i. Carolyn Borg stated that there's a Sept. 30 deadline for revisions.
  - k. Career Days Workshops – attachment
  - l. President Wyse confirms program elimination for University Studies Mathematics degree and the Winemaking Marketing certificate - attachment
  - m. Curriculum materials for BS program - attachment
  - n. Please welcome PT reps Toni Cancilla, James Crockett, and Andrea Williams
6. Discussion/Action items
- a. FEC appointment – Carolyn Singh, non-instructional representative
  - b. New Courses
    - FIRS 138 HazMat First Responder Operations – 1 Unit
    - FIRS 141 Fire Fighter Survival – 0.5 Unit
    - FIRS 182 General Administrative Functions for Company Officers – 1 Unit
    - FIRS 305 Driver/Operator 1A: Emergency Vehicle Operations – Non-Credit
    - FIRS 306 Driver/Operator 1B: Pump Operations – Non-Credit
    - FIRS 335 Intermediate Incident Command System: For Expanding Incidents, I 300 – Non-credit
    - FIRS 338 HazMat First Responder Operations – Non-credit
    - FIRS 341 Fire Fighter Survival – Non-credit
    - FTWO 312 Advanced Firefighter Training S-131 – Non-credit
    - FTWO 321 S-230 Crew Boss (Single Resource) – Non-credit
    - FTWO 322 Engine Boss S-231 – Non-credit
    - FTWO 332 Intermediate Wildland Fire Behavior S-290 – Non-credit
    - FTWO 348 Wildland Firefighter Safety and Survival – Non-credit
    - FTWO 351 Look Up, Look Down, Look Around S-133 – Non-credit
      - i. These new courses were all approved by Curriculum Council. Meridith Randall pointed out that most of these courses are 300-level non-credit courses; Carolyn Borg added that the content of the courses was determined by the fire protection agencies involved. Cathy Anderson moved to approve these new courses; seconded by Jennifer McCandless. Motion carried.
  - c. AS-T in Plant Science – attachments
    - i. This program was approved by Curriculum Council. Brian Spillane moved to approve the degree; seconded by Cathy Anderson. Motion carried.
  - d. Honors Program redux
    - Talking points (not limited to the below items, but be thinking about them)
      - What is the incentive for students?
      - How will the courses be promoted?
      - What assurances are they will be offered/make if faculty step up and do the required curriculum revisions?
      - What courses would work best?

Some possibilities:

CMST 60 or 54, ENGL 1A, ENGL 1C, A science, MATH 14,  
HUM 2 or another C1 course, PHIL 6 or another C2 course  
HIST 17A or 17B, POLS 2, PSYC 1A, A multicultural course

- How many faculty need to sign on for it to “go?”
  - How much work will be required?
  - What is the timeline?
  - What sort of support or assistance will be available?
- i. Robb explained that he has heard from several instructors who would like to see this program be implemented sooner than later. Meridith Randall confirmed that honors version of GE courses will need to have separate course outlines; she requested that the Senate work to hasten the start of this process of generating these outlines. Robb acknowledged that Curriculum deadlines are rapidly approaching, so he wasn't sure it was feasible to meet these. Carolyn Borg pointed out that the course outlines don't need to completely redo the existing course outlines; she said that the Butte College program for honors courses could be a useful model, and she believes that if course outlines were submitted to Curriculum by the end of October, the Scholars Program would be able to come to the Board of Trustees for their December meeting. Several Senate members posed the basic question of why students would even want to take honors courses? Tim stated that some of the incentives include preferences given when students transfer to four-year institutions, as well as more opportunities for scholarships. James Crockett shared his own experience with honors courses when he was a student; he enrolled in an honors course, and although he appreciated the opportunity for more rigorous coursework, he ultimately concluded that it offered no incentives beyond this, so most students would probably not find it appealing enough to pursue honors options. Brian Spillane shared that he was the honors coordinator at another college in Southern California; he noted that there is a statewide honors consortium (HCTT) that sets up partnership agreements between colleges and universities, including some highly competitive ones. He sees many potential benefits for our students who participate in an honors program and for faculty who teach honors course; he elaborated that it's not a matter of students simply doing more work, but different work, with a critical thinking focus in which smaller-sized classes are run more like seminars, so this could be very satisfying for both students and instructors. Carolyn Borg touted the benefits of such a program from the perspective of the college's image as a place of rigorous higher education. Jennifer McCandless and Ray Nicholas reiterated the Senate's support for an honors program, but they acknowledged that the workload that faculty needed to take on would be considerable. Meridith reminded everyone that a November deadline could be set up to allow more time to work on course outlines. Susan Meacham asked who would oversee and handle recruitment of faculty to be involved with an honors program. Would it be Senate? Office of Instruction? Meridith proposed that she would work with Carolyn Borg and Brian Spillane to set up a timeline for development of honors courses that would allow time for consideration by Curriculum; her office will handle recruitment and look into stipends for faculty. Robb acknowledged that this proposal has more structure than previously proposed plans. Cathy Anderson

encouraged Meridith's office to fast track this to avoid having to wait another two weeks until the next Senate meeting for approval; instead, Meridith could just report its progress to the Senate. Cathy Anderson moved to remove the target date of Fall 2017 for implementation of an honors program as specified in her previous motion made during the September 14 meeting; seconded by Scott Gordon. Motion carried.

e. PT evaluations –

- Brian Spillane observe Donna Pratt
  - Tom Morehouse observe Rebecka Renfer & Rob McCandless (Financial Aid/Vet background)
  - Jason Kelly observe Sonia Randhawa
  - Sue Loring observe Michelle Saelee & Amanda Henderson (Evening coverage/Nursing background)
  - Carolyn Borg observe Irma Leal-Cervantes and Roneita Lepage (Tehama)
- i. This list replaces the one brought to the Senate's last meeting. Senate approval was not needed.

f. Peer Evaluators – Attachment

- i. Meridith Randall identified the peer evaluators that needed approval of the Senate; these were faculty members who have not yet received tenure: Trena Kimler-Richards, Craig Carmena, Dhabih Hendershot; Laurie Bish; Lisa Reynolds; Joanne Tippin, Debra Griffin; Scott Yates; Chelle Sugimoto. There was also one peer evaluator who is an administrator: Tony Osa. Jennifer McCandless moved to approve this list of peer evaluators; seconded by Ray Nicholas. Motion carried.

g. Scheduling – Block/no-final week/Flex

- i. Discussion began with differing perspectives on this matter. Linda Thomas noted that Nursing faculty have had difficulty fitting in all their course content into the 17-week format. However, Ray Nicholas stated that the Industrial areas have been pleased with the 17-week schedule. Jennifer McCandless observed that from the Learning Center's perspective faculty seem to be still adjusting to how they handle final exams; she noted that anecdotally students who had experienced both formats, 18 weeks with a dedicated finals week and 17 weeks without a dedicated finals week, were unhappy with the current format, but students who started after the adoption of the new format were satisfied with it. Susan Meacham has observed her students having a more difficult time with the current 17-week format; she explained that there simply isn't enough of a gap between lecture exams and lab exams in her courses. David Cooper was concerned about the wider effects of block scheduling, particularly involving classroom availability and irregular schedules for students; he echoed Jennifer's observation that some students were happy with the current blocked format, whereas others, typically those taking more than 12 units, were not happy. Robb asked about observed impact on enrollment; David stated that he has seen a slight decline because of the unusual and inconsistent times for many classes in the schedule. Meridith Randall reminded everyone that the finals schedule is under the Senate's purview, so we have the ability to reinstate a dedicated finals week; however, she warned against doing this without fully studying the impact of doing so. She also stated that any faculty who do not want to have their classes offered in block scheduling format do not have to do

so. She noted that she has not seen any noticeable impact on enrollment since the beginning of block scheduling; enrollment has declined all across disciplines, but this has been due to many different causes beyond block scheduling. Robb suggested that the College could survey students about their satisfaction with the current scheduling format. Several Senate members noted how difficult it would be to track effects of the schedule over time. So far, the majority of the evidence we have is anecdotal. David Cooper asked that faculty also be surveyed on block scheduling and the 17-week format. Jennifer moved that the Senate seek out student and faculty feedback on, as well as study the impact on student retention and success as a result of, the switch to a 17-week semester calendar and elimination of a dedicated finals week; seconded by Iraj Sivasdas. Motion carried.

- h. Peer Counselor List (Tim Johnston) – attachment
    - i. Because of time constraints, this item was postponed.
  - i. Fall Plenary – Irvine 11/5-7 - <http://bit.ly/FallPlenary15>
    - i. Because of time constraints, this item was postponed.
  - j. Hayward Award - proposed resolution – attachment
    - i. Because of time constraints, this item was postponed.
7. Other?
8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.
9. Next meeting: Monday, October 12, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. in room 1107.

**The Shasta-Tehama Trinity Joint Community College District (“Shasta College”) does not discriminate against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religious preference, age, disability (physical and mental), pregnancy (including pregnancy, childbirth, and medical conditions related to pregnancy or childbirth), gender identity, sexual orientation, genetics, military or veteran status or any other characteristic protected by applicable law in admission and access to, or treatment in employment, educational programs or activities at any of its campuses. Shasta College also prohibits harassment on any of these bases, including sexual harassment, as well as sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.**