

Academic Senate

Open Meeting

Monday, March 13, 2006 * 3:00-5:00 * Room 1108

MINUTES

Executive Committee members present					
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Toby Bodeen	x	Carolyn Borg
x	Dave Bush	x	Candace Byrne	x	Stephen Concklin
x	Kendall Crenshaw		Jeff Cummings (N/V)	x	Kevin Fox
x	Karen Henderson		Pamela Hanford	x	April Howell
	Gary Lewis (N/V)	x	Sue Loring (N/V)	x	Warren Lytle
	Ron Marley	x	Erin Martin	x	Susan Meacham
x	Frank Nigro		Alan Spivey	x	Chuck Spotts
x	Maureen Stephens	x	Terry Turner		Laura Valvatne
	Andrea Williams		Dave Wright (N/V)		

Other faculty present					
Guests present					
x	Tom Orr	x	Ron Johnson	x	Lucha Ortega
x	Catherine Jackson	x	Keith Brookshaw		

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:00.

2. Approval of Minutes –02/27/06 (1 Attachment): Warren Lytle moved approval and Chuck Spotts seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

a. None

4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Hiring Priorities Procedure - Tom Orr, Dave Bush, April Howell, Ron Johnson (One Attachment): *The joint committee to recommend a procedure for developing faculty hiring priorities is presenting their recommendation.*

Tom Orr spoke for the subcommittee on this issue and began by thanking the other subcommittee members for their commitment and good work. He noted that serving on the committee had been a good experience. What the subcommittee had tried to do, he noted, was to shift the focus on hiring priorities and make it clear that replacing retirements, resignations, etc., should be an on-going process, not something that gets done once a year. If a vacancy occurs, action needs to happen right away instead of having vacancies just pile up and up. The notion is that the existing positions have already been approved. If the campus has already funded a position and it becomes vacant, it ought to be a clear cut decision to fill this position.

Cathy questioned the final recommendation under Recommendation Number Two, which would send the hiring list to the Board. She was not sure if this step had been in the original hiring procedure. It was clarified that the hiring list would

go to the Board just for information purposes, not for approval. I.e., they don't end up being the final ones to sign off on it.

There was some concern about the "non-instructional" positions listed under Suggestion #1. Here, the subcommittee suggests "Similar procedures are needed to address the prioritization of new non-instructional positions." Dave Bush noted that no one on the committee was from a non-instructional area, so he said he didn't really know how their procedure would work for such positions. Hence, they thought it best for a separate committee be formed to work on this. The current policy would require Lucha Ortega (a VP) to go to another VP (Academic Affairs) to approve a newly vacant position. This is why they were thinking it would be good to have a separate prioritization procedure. In any case, they didn't feel qualified to make a recommendation on non-instructional faculty and wanted those who *would* know to think about it further.

Warren moved approval of the document as is; Chuck seconded. In the ensuing discussion, Candace Byrne suggested that the subcommittee reconvene to see if it's possible to come up with one procedure that would encompass all faculty. The motion carried.

Kendall Crenshaw then moved that the Senate form a committee to explore either forming a different procedure or else adapting the procedure to include non-instructional faculty. Carolyn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Committee members include Tom Orr, Lucha Ortega, Kendall Crenshaw, Maureen Stephens, Keith Brookshaw, and Candace Byrne. April Howell will sub for Tom if needed. Maureen will call the first meeting. Cathy asked that they meet and be ready to report back to the Senate by May 8.

b. Academic Honesty Procedure - Keith Brookshaw, Frank Nigro (Two Attachments): *Keith Brookshaw is recommending a new procedure on academic honesty as well as a form that instructors will fill out when reporting violations.*

Frank Nigro reviewed what the academic honesty subcommittee had done on this issue. The subcommittee was made up of Frank, Marc Kemp, Laura Valvatne, Lenore Frigo, and Carolyn Singh. After Keith joined the subcommittee, they eventually ended up determining that the procedure he had in place was working just fine, and that's what we reported to the Senate. However, after Don Gray came aboard as the interim VP of Administrative Services, he and Keith had some discussions about some things we had not been sure of regarding academic honesty violations. For example, could the faculty member fail a student prior to the withdraw date for a violation or violations? Could we make it so the violations appeared on the transcript temporarily or otherwise? Don pursued the issue further and told us the answer to both questions was "yes." The two attachments represent a new procedure and a form for faculty and for Student

Development that incorporates these two types of discipline for academic honesty violations.

The Senate reviewed the proposed procedure and form. It was suggested we change the word “plagiarism” on the form to “academic dishonesty.” In step one, it was noted we need to make sure the student is made aware of the documentation. Cathy asked that we insert a sentence about this on #2, after “student”: “Prior to the hearing the student will be given the opportunity to review the documentation.” The Senate also suggested we move the use of the form from step 3 to step 1, and that we make it part of the documentation that would have to go to Student Development. The form will have to be reworked to accommodate this. Also, it was suggested that instead of going to a faculty committee, the instructor would first go to the dean with their complaint and documentation. Scholastic Standards was brought up; should they be brought into the loop, and if so, how?

Dave pointed out that we were starting to wordsmith and that maybe we should let the subcommittee rework the procedure and form with the Senate’s comments. Frank will reconvene the subcommittee and present a revised procedure for our May 8th meeting. Frank asked for further volunteers. Kevin Fox stepped forward to help out with the revisions.

c. Membership for Program Assessment Committee – Cathy: *Last year a joint subcommittee worked hard to develop a Program Assessment Procedure. The Senate adopted this procedure. In the procedure is a standing committee. I want to get this committee formed and functioning.*

Cathy reminded us of the Strategic Planning and Budget committees Mary had formed. As one of his first acts as President, Gary has suspended these committees and convened an ad hoc committee with Catherine Jackson chairing. Their job is to plan how planning will be done. They trying to develop a clear process for how planning on Shasta College will go. They noted how there are many committees on campus that are functioning and have a clear purpose, and others that are functioning are not. So they’re trying to figure out which committees are needed and where they fit in. She reported Senate is working well as well as all its subcommittees. They want the whole college to be functional in this way.

Cathy noted that the Procedure on Program Assessment we developed back in 2004 is a great procedure, and she wants to get it going. Cathy reviewed the proposed committee make-up which includes one academic faculty member and one vocational faculty member. Cathy asked for volunteers, and Chuck volunteered to serve as the academic faculty. Mark Smith’s name was mentioned as a possible vocational rep. Cathy will ask Gary to appoint two people and Lucha will appoint two people.

d. Program Review - Ron Johnson (Two Attachments): *Ron Johnson is requesting a change to the Program Review Schedule.*

Ron Johnson has asked the Senate to consider designing a program review that would cover general ed classes like Dance. Ron noted that Dance is really not a program but a series of classes. He feels it doesn't qualify for the scrutiny that a program requires. Another issue is that there are not full-time faculty in this area. It was pointed out that in something like Russian, we have the same situation.

Cathy reviewed program review for academic programs on the Senate website. She wanted to see if expertise was needed to write the review. After reviewing it, she said that to her, it does not appear that it will take dance expertise for someone in Ron's center to complete the program review. Terry Turner noted that for someone like her, she'd have to interview the dance faculty to be able to determine this. Cathy noted that the same has to be done by the foreign language coordinator when he reviews sign language classes. She reminded us that the existing document was written out of a recognition that clusters of courses like Dance should have a different review from vocational type program reviews. She said that there's no question as to whether a program review should be done; the question was whether Dance should be combined with some other area doing program review. Dave suggested it be done under Performing Arts.

Sue Loring moved that we change the title of Program Review to Review for Academic Programs or Disciplines. Kendall Crenshaw seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Candace moved that for the purposes of discussion, we move dance to next year on the Program Review schedule and combine Music, Theater and Dance into one program. There was discussion of the implications and effects of putting it all together. Several people made the point that these are very different programs/disciplines, and that putting Music and Theater, who have separate Programs, into Dance would not be successful or fair to the instructors. The motion was defeated unanimously.

Dave moved that the Senate request that the Administration to request sufficient funds to hire/compensate adjuncts for writing the Program Review for areas without full-time faculty. Kevin Fox seconded the motion. Discussion followed about whether this fund is part of the contract and should be a part of negotiations. The point was made that a stipend is not part of negotiation. The motion passed.

The discussion then shifted to Humanities and whether it should stay where it is on the Program Review chart. There are two Theater faculty who also teach

Humanities classes in addition to their Theater classes. The question was raised again about whether we should do a Program Review for General Ed.

Ron Johnson thanked the Senate for their consideration of these issues. Cathy referred to the Program Review chart and noted that on the last line there are areas such as Extended Education, and asked whether we should consider whether or not Senate is the right one to be scheduling those program reviews. Dave mentioned that Physical Plant is an area that needs a Program Review, but since it is not an academic area, should Senate even be involved? Cathy mentioned that an ad hoc committee could discuss this.

e. Other

5. Other: Nothing in particular.

6. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, March 27, 2006 in Room 1108.