

Academic Senate
MINUTES
Monday, May 11, 2026
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Room 1101

Executive Committee Members Present					
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Kari Aranbul	x	Chase Brown
x	Jennifer Costillo	x	Scott Croes	x	Cheryl Cruse
x	Leo Fong	x	Chelsea Hendershot	x	Jacquelyn Horton
	Leslie Hyatt	x	Jason Judd	x	Jun Ma
	Sara McCurry	x	Andrew Nail	x	Lisa Riggs
	Chris Rodriguez	x	Alan Spivey	x	Joanne Tippin
x	Robert Waldren	x	Lenore Watson		
x	Mike Mari (N/V)	x	Scott Yates (N/V)		Rebecka Renfer (N/V)
x	Kimberly Carlson (N/V)				
Other Faculty Present					
x	Erick Calderon	x	Heather Wylie		
Guests					
x	Jon Amackar	x	Stacey Bartlett	x	Will Breitbach
x	Tim Johnston	x	Carie Rosensteel		

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.
2. Approval of Minutes—April 27, 2026 (1 attachment): Chelsea Hendershot moved to approve the April 27th minutes; seconded by Chase Brown. Motion carried unanimously.
3. Informational Reports from Guests and Executive Committee Members

- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
- Purpose and Expected Outcome: These agenda items are for invited reports from guests and Executive Committee Members. No action will be taken under these agenda items.
- a. At-Large Elections
 - Presenter: Chase Brown
 - Purpose and Expected Outcome: Chase will let us know the results of the at-large election.

Chase Brown announced that Lisa Riggs, Joanne Tippin, Erick Calderon, and Bethany Davis have been elected as At-Large Representatives for Fall 2026 to Spring 2028.

4. Action Items from Our Subcommittees, Joint Committees, the Office of Instruction, the Office of the Superintendent/President, and others

- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
- Purpose and Expected Outcome: These agenda items are for business that the Academic Senate must discuss and vote on at each meeting.

a. From the Curriculum Committee

New, Revised, or Reactivated Courses and/or Competencies: None at this meeting

New, Revised, or Reactivated Programs: None at this meeting

b. From the Office of Instruction

Tenure Review Committees/Mentors: (1 attachment)

There are three proposed Tenure Review Committees and Mentors, and one proposed Evaluation Committee for a temporary appointment:

- Proposed TRC for Troy Towery (Heavy Equipment Operations Instructor)—Tenure-Track:
 - Chair: Mark Klever, Dean
 - TRC Member: Audra Harl
 - TRC Member: Kate Ashbey
 - TRC Member: Dan Bryant
 - Mentor: Jay Davis
- Proposed TRC for Karine Hunt (Forestry and Natural Resources Instructor)—Tenure Track:
 - Chair: Mark Klever, Dean
 - TRC Member: Melissa Markee
 - TRC Member: Audra Harl
 - TRC Member: Susannah Fulton
 - Mentor: Rebecca Osborne
- Proposed TRC for Brian McElhenny (Physics Instructor)—Tenure Track:
 - TRC Member: David Carico
 - TRC Member: Randy Reed
 - TRC Member: Alan Beamer
 - Mentor: Jen McCandless

- Proposed Evaluation Committee for Leslie Hyatt (Culinary Arts)—
Temporary, Non-Tenure Track:

- Chair: Mark Klever, Dean
- EC Member: Jacquelyn Horton
- EC Member: Joanne Tippin
- EC Member: Jay Davis
- Mentor: Melissa Markee

- i. Chase Brown moved to approve the proposed TRCs and mentors, and proposed EC and mentor listed above; seconded by Jun Ma. Motion carried unanimously.

Fulltime Temporary Evaluations: None at this meeting

Peer Evaluators: None at this meeting

- c. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures from the Office of the Superintendent/President

Review and Approve Category: This category includes APs and BPs with mandated revisions, minor corrections, or no changes. These may be presented and voted on in the same meeting; however, a second reading is possible upon request.

None at this meeting

Revisions Category: This category consists of APs and BPs with substantive content changes. APs and BPs in this category are scheduled for first and second readings.

First Readings: First readings are an opportunity to review, clarify, and suggest changes. We do not make motions or vote on a first reading.

None at this meeting

Second Readings: Second readings are an opportunity to make motions to approve with minor changes. If significant changes are needed, then there will not be a vote and the BP/AP will be brought back for a third reading. (1 attachment)

None at this meeting

Third Readings: If significant changes were made during the second reading, then a third reading is necessary.

None at this meeting

Information Only Category: (1 attachment)

None at this meeting

- d. Hiring Priorities Ranking Process—Lisa Riggs and Jacquelyn Horton

- The Hiring Priorities Committee has met for its third round of ranking. The role of the Academic Senate is to confirm that the procedure was followed correctly.

Cathy Anderson explained the role of Senate in certifying the ranking of the hiring priorities list. Jacquelyn Horton and Lisa Riggs confirmed that the procedure for ranking hiring requests for full-time tenure-track faculty outlined in AP 7210 was properly followed. Alan Spivey moved to certify that the procedure outlined in AP 7210 was properly followed during the latest ranking of the hiring priorities list; seconded by Jennifer Costillo. Motion carried unanimously. Scott Yates pointed out that there were two replacement English positions requested, but only one was approved for the previous ranking, and the second is not on this latest ranking. Mike Mari stated that he would check on this.

e. Sample Syllabus Statement Suggestions (3 attachments)

- We asked the Shasta College AI Ambassadors to recommend to us some sample syllabus statements that faculty could use to explain AI policies in their courses. The AI Ambassadors have submitted sample language for our consideration. Also included as attachments are examples from the English Department.

Cathy Anderson reminded everyone that during our last meeting Sara McCurry had suggested that we review the AI policy statements that have been developed by English Department faculty to help us revise the sample syllabus statements that were submitted by the AI Ambassadors. She first reviewed the sample syllabus statements from the AI Ambassadors. Jennifer Costillo requested that a statement be added in the “AI for Planning” option emphasizing that any research results derived from AI needs to be verified; there was consensus that the statement from the “AI as a Collaborator” option could be used here: “You remain fully responsible for the accuracy, quality, and integrity of your final submission, and all AI assistance must be clearly cited.” Scott Yates suggested including a statement that makes a distinction between generative AI and agentic AI and specifying that agentic AI cannot be used: “You may use generative AI tools, but not agentic tools, in this course.” This distinction could also be added in the other options. Erick Calderon suggested adding in the introductory paragraph mention of the Academic Honesty policy covered in BP 5500 as the basis for consequences for violating an instructor’s AI policy. Cathy Anderson proposed adding a fifth option, “Varied AI Integration,” that allows for AI policies that are assignment-specific within a course: “The AI policies in this course are assignment specific. Each assignment will clearly....” There was support for adding a statement of the rationale and purpose for having an AI policy, as well as specifying what ethical and appropriate use of AI entails. Cathy added the statement “The Shasta College Academic Senate strongly recommends that your course syllabus include an AI policy to protect both you and your students” at the start of the document. There was discussion about where the AI policy should be placed within a syllabus to give it prominence.

f. Academic Senate Representative to the PRC

- The Academic Senate representative to the Program Review Committee is vacant, so we need to make an appointment.

Cathy Anderson explained that we need a representative to the Program Review Committee. The committee meets once a month on a Thursday through Zoom. Lisa

Riggs stated that she would be willing to serve as representative. Kari Aranbul moved to appoint Lisa Riggs as Academic Senate representative to the Program Review Committee; seconded by Lenore Watson. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Project-Based Discussion/Action Items

- These agenda items will vary to reflect the current projects that the Academic Senate is working on.
- a. AI Project
 - To Do List:
 - Develop a Philosophy Statement for faculty (done)
 - Review and update AP/BP 5500 (a workgroup has been established with a goal of fall)
 - Develop suggested guidelines for course syllabi (Executive Committee is working on this)

See discussion for item 4.e above.

6. Standing Reports from Subcommittees, Joint Committees, and Related Groups

- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
- Purpose and Expected Outcome: Subcommittees, Joint Committees, and related groups are invited to update the Executive Committee about their current work. No action will be taken under these agenda items.
- a. Report from the Academic Senate President (Cathy Anderson)
Cathy Anderson shared an email request from a *Cal Matters* reporter asking for faculty who can be interviewed about online education. Stacey Bartlett suggested that this request be forwarded to Peter Griggs.
- b. Report from College Council (Will Breitbach or Cathy Anderson)
Will Breitbach reported that College Council forwarded the Strategic Educational Master Plan to the Board of Trustees for approval.
- c. Reports from Standing Subcommittees (Reports are given by the Co-Chairs or members as needed)
 - i. Curriculum Committee (Co-Chairs: Scott Yates and Mike Mari)
No report.
 - ii. Scholastic Standards Committee (Co-Chairs: Lenore Watson and Jamie Spielmann)
No report.
 - iii. Faculty Excellence Committee (Co-Chairs: Valerie Ambrose and Will Breitbach)
No report.
 - iv. General Education Committee (Co-Chairs: Rebecka Renfer and Stacey Bartlett)
No report.
 - v. SLO Committee (Co-Chairs: Kimberly Carlson and Will Breitbach)
Kimberly Carlson reported that the committee recently sent out instructions for reporting SLO results.

- d. Reports from Joint Committees (Reports are given by the Co-Chairs or delegate as needed)
 - i. Student Success Committee (Tri-Chairs: Kate Mahar, Bex Davis, and Heather Wylie)
Heather Wylie reported that the committee has been updating its bylaws, and she provided brief updates on several projects, including improving communications with students.
 - e. Professional Development Coordinator (Valerie Ambrose)
No report.
 - f. Office of Instruction (Mike Mari)
Mike Mari reported a proposed change to the Pass/No Pass process where instructors submit a letter grade that would be converted to a Pass or No Pass but that could be converted back to a letter grade if requested.
7. Items to Communicate
- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
 - Purpose and Expected Outcome: This agenda item is an opportunity for members to collectively summarize the important outcomes from the meeting. This will encourage communication between representatives and faculty in their areas.
- The following items were recognized as important to share with colleagues:
8. Other
- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
 - Purpose and Expected Outcome: This agenda item is for members to bring up topics not on the agenda. This is also an opportunity to determine interest in a possible future agenda item topic. No action will be taken under this agenda item.
 - a. Heather Wylie reminded everyone that the PEAK Institute is seeking faculty to enroll for the upcoming academic year.
9. Opportunity for Public Comment
- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
 - Purpose and Expected Outcome: 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 under this agenda item. Speakers are limited to three minutes.
10. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.
11. Next Meeting: Monday, August 24, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 1101

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.