

*Approved 8/28/06*

Academic Senate

**Open Meeting**

Monday, May 8, 2006 \* 3:00-5:00 \* Room 1108

**MINUTES**

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

x	Andrea Williams		Dave Wright (N/V)		
Other faculty present					
x	Lenore Frigo				
Guests present					
x	Lucha Ortega	x	Ron Johnson	x	Joan Bosworth
x	Catherine Jackson				

1. Call to Order: The Senate presented Cathy Anderson with a plaque and gifts commemorating her five years of service as the Academic Senate President. Many kind words were said about her. The meeting was formally called to order at 3:15.
2. Approval of Minutes –03/27/06 and 04/24/06 (2 Attachments): Chuck Spotts moved approval of the 3/27 minutes; Terry Turner seconded. Dave Bush moved approval of the 4/24 minutes. Kendall Crenshaw seconded. Both motions carried unanimously.
3. Reports
  - a. Plenary Session report--Lenore Frigo was the college's delegate to this spring's State Academic Senate Plenary Session. She reported that "how to ensure effective student contact" in online classes was a hot issue. The hottest issue, though, was the proposal to allow adjunct faculty to teach 80%. Of five resolutions opposing this, the Senate passed all five, and not by small margins. Lenore clarified the rationale behind the Senate's vote. She then asked us to consider how going to 80% would impact our school. It may be an issue we will have to return to as the Board of Governors may not go along with the Senate's opposition to this proposal.
  - b. Plenary Session report, Part Deux--Frank Nigro: Frank attended about half the Plenary Session as a "presenter" for the Tech Committee, so he was mostly tied down to tech-related sessions. He did note surprise at the Senate's opposition to

the 80% proposal. Faculty he had spoken with at the Plenary seemed more or less split on the issue. He had expected this to drag on for a few semesters.

#### 4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Tenure Review Committees (One Attachment): *Proposed committees for 2006-2007 already approved, with a change for Tom Morehouse's TRC and David Gentry's mentor.*

There are two changes to this attachment from the last meeting. On Tom Morehouse's committee, Toby Bodeen and Kendall Crenshaw have been added. On David Gentry's committee, David did not have a functioning mentor in the first year, so it was decided to assign Lorraine Haas to be his mentor. Terry moved approval of these changes and Toby Bodeen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Online Course Development Procedure-Frank (No Attachment): *A follow up on our last discussion.*

Frank Nigro forwarded the revised procedure on Friday. He explained to the Senate that the Distance Ed Committee agreed to make this a "recommended" procedure, and they made some changes accordingly.

Frank moved that the Senate approve this procedure as a recommended procedure for instructors developing new online classes. Ron Marley seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Frank moved that the Senate recommend that the instructional deans allow instructors to teach new online courses only when the procedure is followed. Ron seconded the motion. The motion carried with two no votes. There was some discussion about whether the Senate should be prescribing to the deans what they should do.

Frank next moved that the Senate urge the deans insert a note about this procedure on the proposed schedule each semester for any faculty teaching a new online class. The note would say something to the effect that any faculty scheduled to teach a new online class may have their online section changed to something else if they don't follow the recommended procedure. Andrea Williams seconded. In the ensuing discussion, it was argued that this was again too prescriptive to the deans, that it was telling the deans how to do their jobs. Others countered that it was just a recommendation and that the deans did not have to follow it. The motion tied, and therefore did not carry.

Cathy reiterated how much the Senate appreciated the DEC's work on this procedure.

c. Hiring Priorities Procedure-Cathy (No Attachment): *A follow up on our last discussion.*

Cathy explained the latest on this procedure: Gary Lewis sent the procedure from Instructional Council to the ad hoc planning committee. Lucha Ortega noticed some inconsistencies in language and made some changes. Cathy explained these and some additional changes from IC. Dave moved approval of the policy. Susan Meacham seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Tomorrow this will go to Cabinet.

d. Matriculation Committee Membership and Status – Cathy and Sue (No Attachment)

Matriculation, a formal standing Senate subcommittee, has some non-Senate members on it (currently, the membership includes someone from Research, the Tech department, and a student rep). Cathy believes that if we have a standing Senate subcommittee, it should only contain Senate members. She suggested that maybe Matriculation should be made a non-Senate committee, similar to the Distance Ed Committee.

The Senate discussed this, explored options, and Dave suggested we might need a whole new class of committees that are “standing joint” committees that would consult with the Senate and report to the Senate but that would have a different relationship with the Senate.

Cathy noted that next year, we will need to revise our bylaws to include the new committee on staff development. We can revisit the issue then.

e. Background Check/Drug Screen Procedures for A.S. Degree Nursing Students – Joan Bosworth (One attachment).

Joan Bosworth explained the attached procedure for doing a background check on nursing degree students. Many employers will not hire someone if they fail the background check, so the procedure is to protect students; Nursing has had students complete their degrees, only to be told no one would hire them because of some past transgression. The attached procedure is rough, so Joan was presenting it more as a f.y.i. at this point. Pat Demo noted that she wanted to see how other schools have handled the issue. Various issues surrounding such a procedure, like confidentiality or who would do the checks, were discussed. Also, for Pat to have a reason to do such a check, she apparently has to consider the students doing clinical as “college volunteers.” The college has a different set of standards than do the hospitals. The hospitals are more liberal than the college, so if there’s a positive hit here, it might hurt the student when applying for a job. Also, if there’s positive hit, Pat can’t tell a student why.

Chuck questioned whether this was something we should do or that the hospitals should do instead. Sue argued it falls under “student preparation and success.” We will re-visit this in the fall.

5. Other #1: Gary noted that we propose to Cabinet that we fill a faculty position in Mechanical Technologies and Environmental Resources. It would replace Jeff Cummings’ position. He wants to make an immediate recommendation to Cabinet to fill this. We have a number of ongoing projects that would be left in the lurch. There are also some grants we have where we need a lead person to take them over. So, he wanted to give us a heads up. Cathy noticed that this would be a test of our new Hiring Procedure.

Other #1: Gary reported that the planned division reorganization is off the table now. Nursing will now report to the VP of Instruction, but organizationally, we’re not going to make the changes previously discussed. Also, on an interim basis, we will be opening up an in-house position for the LRC director. And we’re applying to be the home of the Small Business Development Center (SBDC), which is currently run by a private group in the region; it’s one of only two in the state not housed by a community college.

6. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:35.

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, May 22, 2006 ← *This meeting has been cancelled.*