

Academic Senate
MINUTES
 Monday, February 25, 2019
 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
 Room 1109

Executive Committee Members Present					
	Cathy Anderson	x	Kari Aranbul	x	Jim Bigelow
x	James Crockett		Anthony Eckhardt	x	Leslie Ellingson
x	Leo Fong	x	Lenore Frigo	x	Scott Gordon
x	Chaz Kelley		Robb Lightfoot	x	Mindy Marlatt
x	Susan Meacham		Haley Mulvihill	x	Ray Nicholas
x	Carolyn Singh		Jeff Specht		Linda Thomas
x	Craig Thompson	x	Joanne Tippin	x	Susan Westler
	Don Cingrani (N/V)		Frank Nigro (N/V)		Scott Yates (N/V)
Other Faculty Present					
x	Sara McCurry				
Guests					
x	Stacey Bartlett	x	Tim Johnston	x	Becky McCall
x	John Yu				

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.
2. Approval of Minutes (Attachment)—February 11, 2019: Ray Nicholas moved to approve the February 11th minutes; seconded by Kari Aranbul. Motion carried with one abstention (Craig Thompson).

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. Reports
 - a. Report from the Academic Senate President (Cathy Anderson)
 - i. No report.
 - b. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
 - i. No report.
 - c. Report from College Council (Frank Nigro or Cathy Anderson)
 - i. No report.
 - d. Reports from Standing Subcommittees (Reports are given by the Co-Chair or delegate as needed)
 - i. Curriculum Committee (Co-Chairs: Scott Yates, Frank Nigro)
 1. No report.
 - ii. Scholastic Standards Committee (Co-Chairs: Don Cingrani, Tim Johnston)
 1. No report.
 - iii. Faculty Excellence Committee (Co-Chairs: Melanee Grondahl, Jennifer McCandless)
 1. No report.
 - iv. General Education Committee (Co-Chairs: Susan Westler, Carlos Reyes)
 1. Susan Westler reported that the committee reviewed six courses to be added to the GE pattern.
 - v. SLO Committee (Co-Chairs: Sara McCurry, Kate Ashbey, Will Breitbach)
 1. Sara McCurry reported that there will be a demonstration of eLumen, an alternative to Nuventive Improve (formerly TracDat), this Friday, March 1, at 10:00 a.m. in the CELT room in the Library. Last Thursday, she also sent out an email to all faculty providing instructions for completing the SLO Reflection Form for this year.
 - e. Reports from Joint Committees (Reports are given by the Co-Chair or delegate as needed)
 - i. Distance Education Committee (Co-Chairs: Tom Glass, Will Breitbach)
 1. Carolyn Singh reported that at the last meeting, the committee unanimously voted to recommend that the Academic Senate approve the Online Education Initiative (OEI) Course Design Rubric (see item 6.k below).
 - ii. Student Success Committee (Co-Chairs: Jim Crooks, John Yu)
 1. No report.
 - f. Report from the Institutional Assessment Committee (Sara McCurry)
 - i. No report.
 - g. Guided Pathways (Jennifer McCandless)
 - i. No report.

5. Informational Items
 - a. Susan Meacham sent out an email earlier today informing all faculty that the nomination period for the Excellent Educator Awards, full-time and part-time, is now open, with a deadline of March 29th.

6. Discussion/Action items

- a. Proposed Peer Evaluators (1 attachment)
 - i. There were three proposed peer evaluators in BAITS (Donavan Lacy to evaluate Don Fennell, Thomas Fields, and Michael Wilson; Jeff Hendrickson to evaluate Stephanie McClung; Rick Osbrink to evaluate Bret Richard and Paul York), and two in SLAM (Bing Xu to evaluate Michael Fox, and Jim Bigelow to evaluate David Woodruff). Ray Nicholas moved to approve the entire list of proposed peer evaluators; seconded by Craig Thompson. Motion carried unanimously.
- b. Hiring Priorities Ranking – Susan Meacham and Scott Gordon
<https://www.boarddocs.com/ca/shasta/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=AWVAPR28AF30>
Since our last meeting we have had an additional resignation which causes another round of prioritizing. The Academic Senate's role in the process is to certify that the process has been followed correctly.
 - i. Susan Meacham reviewed the process for this latest re-ranking; the only difference from the previous ranking was that the Math position was changed from new to replacement. Scott Gordon moved to certify that the procedure outlined in AP 7210 was properly followed for the re-ranking of the hiring priorities list; seconded by Susan Westler. Motion carried unanimously.

Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Second Readings: (*We may vote on second readings.*)

- c. AP 4040 – Library Services – Second Reading (1 attachment)
 - i. Susan Meacham noted that all the proposed changes from our last meeting were incorporated. Scott Gordon moved to approve AP 4040; seconded by Leslie Ellingson. Motion carried unanimously.
- d. BP 4100 – Graduation Requirements – Second Reading (1 attachment)
 - i. Susan Meacham noted that all proposed changes from our last meeting were incorporated. Ray Nicholas moved to approve BP 4100; seconded by Mindy Marlatt. Motion carried unanimously.
- e. BP 4110 – Honorary Degrees – Second Reading (1 attachment)
 - i. Lenore Frigo moved to approve BP 4110; seconded by Chaz Kelley. Susan Westler asked about our previous discussion concerning adding a procedure for revoking honorary degrees. Susan Meacham stated that there was an email exchange that led to the conclusion that we should first have in place a procedure for granting honorary degrees before we have a discussion about revoking such degrees. Motion carried with one abstention (Susan Westler).
- f. AP 4222 – Remedial Coursework – Second Reading (1 attachment)
 - i. Susan Meacham noted that there was only one change made, replacing the word “probability” with “likelihood” in the first paragraph. Scott Gordon wondered if non-credit adult education courses would fall under this category of remedial coursework. Jim Bigelow moved to approve AP 4222; seconded by Kari Aranbul. Motion carried unanimously.
- g. BP 4231 – Grade Changes – Second Reading (1 attachment)
 - i. Lenore Frigo moved to approve BP 4231; seconded by Chaz Kelley. Motion carried unanimously.
- h. AP 4235 – Credit by Examination – Second Reading (1 attachment)
 - i. Susan Westler requested that this item be tabled to allow for more time to thoroughly read the AP. Scott Gordon shared his experience with credit by exam; in particular, he found that students often are not aware that the grade they receive on the exam is the grade they get for the course; he also emphasized that some courses are not

appropriate for credit by examination. Susan Meacham shared that none of the science lab instructors want any of their courses to be eligible for credit by examination. Mindy Marlatt questioned if Qualification #3, which states that “a student may earn no more than fifteen (15) cumulative units through credit by examination procedure,” was for one year or one semester. It was unclear why this limit was specified. Susan Meacham asked everyone to take this back to their constituents for input so that it can be voted on at our next meeting.

i. Add-Code

This semester we are piloting a new expiration date for the add codes. We agreed to discuss the results of our pilot during this semester and revise as appropriate.

- i. Tim Johnston reported that students and faculty generally approved of the extended expiration date for add codes, and he had recommended the deadline be extended to the day before census. Faculty would still retain control over whom add codes would be given to. If we would go ahead with this, there was general agreement that faculty would need to be clearly informed about when the census will occur each semester. Susan Meacham asked everyone to take this matter back to their constituents for input.

j. Student Equity and Achievement Program Presentation – Tim Johnston (1 attachment)

- i. Tim Johnston presented an overview of the Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEAP), which is a combination of three previous programs (SSSP, Student Equity, and the BSI) into one block grant program. This program is part of the Chancellor’s Vision for Success. In order to receive funding, there are certain requirements. Each college must: Have a student equity plan (which is due June 30th); provide student matriculation services; comply with AB 705; and provide all students with an education plan. An integrated plan is no longer required, and funding will not be based on the previous allocation formulas. However, assessment for placement is still required under AB 705. Also, noncredit services are not separately funded. With this change, the Chancellor’s office specifies that all expenditures should be “reasonable and justifiable.” The financial responsibility lies ultimately with each college, with a clear list of non-allowable expenditures. Tim noted that there’s a lot that we don’t know yet, such as whether all the MIS (Management Information Systems) data will still be required, what the new education plan requirements will be, whether funds can be used for embedded tutoring that generates FTES, what the components of the SEAP report will be, and when all existing codes and regulations will be aligned. Tim stated that the draft of the SEAP report will come to Senate in late March or early April.

k. OEI Course Design Rubric – Will Breitbach

<https://cvc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/CVC-OEI-Course-Design-Rubric-rev.10.2018.pdf>

The statewide Academic Senate recommends that [local Senates adopt the OEI course design rubric](#). The Distance Education Committee therefore suggests that the Academic Senate endorse the OEI Rubric as a recommended best practice for online course design.

- i. Carolyn Singh provided some background on this design rubric, noting that the Distance Education Committee unanimously recommended that the Academic Senate adopt it. Lenore Frigo asked for more information on what adoption would entail. Carolyn emphasized that the rubric offers recommended best practices rather than stipulates requirements that online instructors must follow. Stacey Bartlett characterized this as an additional resource for online instructors. However, Ray Nicholas and Susan Westler wanted to hear from faculty who have been involved with this project before we vote on it. Because of this, Susan Meacham agreed to table this item for a later meeting.

7. Other— No action may be taken on discussions under the “other” agenda item.
 - a. Mindy Marlatt asked about the progress of the faculty inquiry group working on the computer literacy requirement for graduation. Susan Westler stated that the group met once, but there has not been any further development.
8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.
9. Next meeting: Monday, March 11, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 1109

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.