

Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, Sept. 25, 2006
3:00-4:45 p.m.

Room 1108

Minutes:

Executive Committee members present					
X	Cathy Anderson (N/V)	X	Terry Bailey	X	Candace Byrne
X	Stephen Concklin	X	Lois Cushnie (N/V)	X	Kendall Crenshaw
X	Leo Fong	X	Lenore Frigo	X	Karen Henderson
	Pamela Hanford	X	April Howell	X	Jason Kelly
X	Guy Klitgaard	X	Ron Marley		Erin Martin
X	Susan Meacham		Peggy Moore	X	Ray Nicholas
X	Frank Nigro	X	Randy Reed		Terrie Snow
	Robert Soffian		Chuck Spotts		Maureen Stephens

	Ramón Tello	X	Andrea Williams		Dave Wright (N/V)
Other faculty present					
X	Brad Shackleford for Maureen Stephens	X	Sue Loring		
Guests present					
X	Lucha Ortega				

1. Call to Order: President Frank Nigro called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes – 9/11/06 (1 attachment)

Guy Klitgaard moved approval of the minutes from the 9/11/06 meeting. Lenore Frigo seconded. The minutes were revised to show that Randy Reed was not present at the 9/11 meeting. The motion was amended to approve the minutes with that change, and it passed unanimously.

3. Reports

a. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham; no attachment):

Susan Meacham reported on some action and discussion from the Instructional Council. The Council approved two certificates, one in nonprofit organizational management and the other in web design. The Council again discussed how best to collect census data for online courses, in lieu of the current policy of using positive attendance. They also discussed how to make more consistent the process and timeline by which all faculty receive their load assignment forms—and make deans more proactive in predicting which courses might be cancelled for low enrollment so that they can develop contingency plans. In addition, the IC also discussed whether faculty are required to be on campus five days a week, since deans do not enforce such presence uniformly; suggestions at IC included asking the Senate and/or Faculty Association to define “instructional duties,” the term the faculty contract uses in specifying the five-day/week requirement.

In another IC discussion item, Vice President Peggy Moore declared faculty development her number one priority. She pondered how to get money earmarked for faculty development and encourage faculty attendance at conferences, the cost of which such funds could reimburse.

Frank Nigro commented that the Distance Ed. Committee is investigating the issue of when faculty signature is required to add an online class. Initial proposal was that signature permission would be required after the 2nd day the course starts.

b. Update on Math/English Requirements (1 attachment): *The attached email is from the state Senate office. The Board of Governors has approved upping the Math/English requirements. Now it goes to the Chancellor's Office for further review.*

Frank Nigro presented background on this issue. Over the last few years, statewide discussion resulted in a recommendation by the State Academic Senate to the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges to raise graduation requirements in English and math. Recommended graduation requirements were intermediate algebra (Math 102) and college composition (Engl 1A). The BoG recently approved the recommendation, with an implementation date of fall 09, and sent the recommendation to the Chancellor's Office for input. The new requirements will affect students who want AS degree. Cathy Anderson reported that math has created a course for AS students and is now researching to see how many students will be affected. Possibly BUAD 66 would meet Engl 1A requirement. Kendall Crenshaw suggested establishing a cross disciplinary implementation committee to examine implications of the new requirement. This group would investigate possibilities for course equivalencies and also assure that appropriate support services were in place to assist students in meeting the new requirements. The group could also determine what testing scores (ACT, SAT, etc.) would meet the requirement

c. Other:

Kendall Crenshaw reported that some student support areas are indeed working on SLOs. Some student support areas have written SLOs and begun to assess, contrary to what was reported in minutes of 8/28. April Howell reported that Doug Milhous, Christina Berisso, Scott Gordon and herself are working to develop a way to report SLO assessment in the Business division. The method they devise is intended to pilot such reporting possibilities.

Frank reported meeting with Caroline Borg to discuss the question of computer literacy skills that would meet general education requirements. Frank will request of Instructional Council the names of a faculty member from each division, which group would define computer literacy and then proceed to determine what coursework or equivalent will fulfill the computer literacy standard defined.

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Electronic progress reports (Jason Kelly, Sue Loring; no attachment): *In April, 2005, the Senate gave the thumbs-up to an Early Alert progress report proposal from Counseling. This proposal would give instructors the option to complete "early alert" progress reports on students . In September, 2005, a hold was put*

on this as Senate and Matriculation agreed to evaluate new software that would let us do such reports electronically. This evaluation has been done, but there are some further snags . . .

Sue Loring reported some history of this issue: Last year the Matriculation Committee recommended using a Datatel course enrollment screen to provide early alerts on students with potential problems in their courses. Such an approach would generate a letter to identified student recommending interventions. Contra Costa College had developed a system for early alert that might have the capacity to identify particular problems—attendance, test scores, etc.—and the Matriculation Committee thought that system might fit our needs, but this new program ran into implementation problems. The item is again in the Matriculation Committee agenda. Another issue on Matriculation’s agenda is committee composition. The Committee wants to assure IT representation, so the Committee will also include Doug Meline. Frank Nigro asked the Committee to review the committee’s composition and by-laws and, if necessary, bring proposed changes to the Senate.

Cathy Anderson and Lucha Ortega reported that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is developing a template for committee bylaws, so that every committee could be standardized with respect to by-law format.

b. Role of Curriculum Council (Ron Marley; 1 link below): *Two meetings ago Ron asked the Senate for input on the mission of Curriculum Council, which is a standing subcommittee of the Senate. What does Curriculum do and how might we strengthen its role? He would like some more discussion on the issue. The Curriculum Council Handbook appears in PDF form at <http://www3.shastacollege.edu/instruction/curriculum/curriculum%20images/Curr%20Hndbk-2006-07.pdf>. The functions of Curriculum are described on page 5.*

Ron Marley, Curriculum Committee chair, asked the Senate to look at Curriculum bylaws and give direction to the Committee. Ron’s assessment is that the Committee meets its state-mandated reporting requirements very well, through an incredible amount of paperwork and tracking. He commented that the Committee might skirt issues related to curriculum that it should be discussing, for example, whether staffing and equipment are appropriate for actually teaching proposed, approved courses or whether a course actually meets a general education requirement it is designed to satisfy. Many senators agreed that the purpose of the Curriculum Committee is to provide oversight, a function different from what is expected from department curriculum committees. Senators also suggested that Curriculum could legitimately address SLO issues on course outlines and that, if addressed during the course outline review process, SLOs would be in place for all courses within a few years.

With respect to the Curriculum Committee’s responsibility for program review, the Committee hears each program review—Ron remarked that some are “stunning” and applauded at the meeting—but the Committee has no power to respond to program reviews in any budgeting or planning respect. Many senators agreed that Program Review needs to be tied to the budget process, once the

College has a transparent process. Cathy Anderson and Lucha Ortega reported that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is developing a transparent process. It would link program reviews to a College Planning Committee that does make budgeting and development recommendations.

Ron Marley closed this discussion by saying that the Curriculum Committee will report the issues they discuss to the Senate. Frank Nigro suggested that, if the Curriculum Committee wants Program Review reports handled in a different manner, they bring their recommendations for change to the Senate.

6. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10.

7. Next meeting: ***Monday, Oct. 9, in Room 1108.***