

Academic Senate

**Open Meeting**

Monday, Oct. 24, 2005 \* 3:00-5:00 \* Room 1119

**MINUTES**

<b>Executive Committee members present</b>					
<b>x</b>	<b>Cathy Anderson</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>Toby Bodeen</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>Carolyn Borg</b>
	Dave Bush	<b>x</b>	Candace Byrne		Stephen Concklin
<b>x</b>	Kendall Crenshaw		Jeff Cummings (N/V)		Divan Fard
<b>x</b>	Kevin Fox		Karen Henderson		Pamela Hanford
<b>x</b>	April Howell	<b>x</b>	Gary Lewis (N/V)	<b>x</b>	<b>Sue Loring (N/V)</b>
<b>x</b>	Warren Lytle	<b>x</b>	<b>Ron Marley</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

<b>x</b>	Andrea Williams		Dave Wright (N/V)		
<b>Other faculty present</b>					
<b>x</b>	Lemoine Waite				
<b>Guests present</b>					
<b>x</b>	Tom Orr	<b>x</b>	Brian Spillane	<b>x</b>	Joan Bosworth

1. Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 3:05.

2. Approval of Minutes –10/10/05 (1 Attachment): Toby Bodeen moved approval and Andrea Williams seconded. A few minor changes were made. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Reports

a. Update on the Academic Honesty Policy – Frank Nigro.

Marc Kemp and Frank explained the progress on their subcommittee on academic honesty. As a reminder, last spring the Senate approved some recommended changes to Board policy that this subcommittee had worked on. From there, they turned to formulating a specific administrative policy for dealing with academic honesty. After much work on this and back-and-forth with Student Development, the subcommittee determined that academic honesty cases were being handled effectively by Student Development. They do not see a need to further define the policy.

The subcommittee stressed that more staff development presentations on and faculty discussion of the issue was needed.

Cathy Anderson noted we need to get the word out and help faculty understand what documentation is needed when they approach Student Development with an academic honesty complaint. The question arose as to how best to do this. She suggested that Marc and Frank work on a 1-2 page document about this. Also, Candace suggested we look at the faculty handbook to see if it has anything about this. There were questions about who is now in charge of the faculty handbook in Jim Poulsen's absence.

b. Cathy congratulated the Senate, noting that of the seven commendations at the final accreditation meeting, two of them were for good Senate work. Multiple Measures and SLOs were mentioned. Joan Bosworth was there to confirm this and to heap praise upon the Senate.

c. Cathy had a few words to say about the budget. Jack Briggs, interim VP gave an updated budget report at College Council. Things have not improved, and we're definitely down 350 FTEs. If we don't recover our FTEs, we're going to be down \$1.3 million. Briggs did a projection from the budget and found that as far as the expenditures part, with everything staying the same, energy costs going up, and step increases, we're down an additional \$800,000+. So, in total we're down at least \$2 million. Salaries make up all by seven of our \$32 million budget. We've already shaved off every single cent we can find, so further cuts won't help us much, unless we start dipping into salaries.

Cathy noted that this truly is a dire situation, not simply a negotiating ploy on the administration's part.

Discussion turned to solutions. If every single person on campus (faculty, staff, administration) takes a 3-unit class, we'll end up with only 30 of the 350 FTEs we're short of. That would make a dent in things and would help. There was some discussion about classes that are cancelled and why. Worksite learning was discussed as a way to help. Gary said we're reorganizing this to streamline it, make it auditable, more effective. If students sign up for it, it requires just a slight increase of work for faculty, but it has the potential to increase our FTEs substantially. The possibility of having a double summer school was also raised.

#### 4. Discussion/Action Items

a. Horticulture Degree Proposal (1 Attachment): *This has been approved by the Curriculum.*

Cathy reminded us that Curriculum has approved this degree proposal. We generally rely on what Curriculum proposes to us. Lemoine Waite was available to answer questions. She noted that for our students to get a degree in this area, they've had to go elsewhere. This degree would solve this problem and would allow students to seamlessly transfer to Chico State. No new classes are being offered through the degree. Lemoine noted that it probably wouldn't increase enrollment. Sue Loring and Toby moved approval. The motion carried unanimously. The paperwork will now go on to the Chancellor's Office.

Joan noted that Lemoine was applauded by Chico State on her work on this and her efforts to keep students in the Northstate.

b. Standardized Syllabi (1 Attachment): *Presentation by the subcommittee that has been working on this project. We will decide whether the draft is ready to be sent forward to all faculty for discussion and input. We will not adopt this at this meeting.*

A subcommittee has been working on a template that faculty can use when putting together their syllabi. Brian Spillane, Tom Orr, Joan, and Terry reported on their progress. Terry noted that the objective was to make sure all faculty knew the basic things they needed to have, not just to stay out of trouble, but to help students. She reviewed the template, explaining each item. The subcommittee asked for feedback on this.

Frank asked that we put in some specific language about academic honesty, providing perhaps two or three real examples of possible academic honesty policies from different instructors.

Regarding #11, there was a question about how much instructors should have to put into course calendar, how much assignments are worth, etc. Terry clarified that what they're looking for here is some sort of clarification of how a grade is given. It was pointed out this is a "tentative" course sequence. Under Tentative Course Sequence, we crossed out "by week (could be a calendar)."

Regarding #8 – "all components of grading must be expressed by numbers" – there were also some questions. The subcommittee was asked to use flexible language about grading policies, the value of assignments. Brian explained that from a dean's point of view, if there's a grade complaint, it helps a dean to see the instructor's grading policy and to compare it to what the student says. The first bullet was crossed off, and the second bullet was changed to "Grading system must be measurable and well defined."

The process paragraph will be removed. Terry will send an updated form to Cathy, who will send it out to the entire faculty for feedback. From there, it will go to Instructional Council and back to the Senate for approval.

c. Hiring Priorities List (Attachment forwarded tomorrow after Instructional Council meeting): *Our role is to forward this list to Cabinet with our comments and recommendations.*

The Senate discussed these priorities in light of the budget problems. Cathy reminded us that several years ago, the Senate wrote a procedure to prioritize hirings. We gave the deans the authority to prioritize hirings but asked to look at the priorities list and give feedback. There were 25 requests, Gary noted, and the list represents the top 15 of these. Gary suggested we'll probably hire a couple of these, despite the budget problems. With the Veterinary Technician position, we have about 200 students in the program, but we don't have a full time teacher.

Unfortunately, adjuncts cannot do worksite learning. So now we rely on a full time faculty in a different area to do this. So, we need the position. With the Education position, Gary noted that we are started to become involved in Chico State's program. It has a worksite learning component, and we have no full timers who can do this at this point.

There is one definite retirement this year (Philosophy). Otherwise, we don't know what other needs might come up.

Cathy noted we need to forward this with comments. She will forward it with a note saying that the Senate is comfortable that the Hiring Priorities Procedure was followed and that due to present circumstances, we do not object to new and replacement positions being integrated.

d. Professional Development Committee (No Attachment) – Candace: *Candace will update us on the current status of the NPG Committee and we will discuss how we want to proceed with a PD Committee.*

Candace gave a little background on staff development at Shasta College, how the Network for Professional Growth developed, how there were several funding sources, etc. As the funding dried up, the function of NPG began to shrink and eventually dissolved. Now, Pat Demo has come to plan Flex. Faculty Senates do have responsibility for policies relating to faculty development. As far as Candace can tell, there is no Board Policy on staff development. So, Candace thinks this is where we should start, by developing Board Policy. Candace noted that in most districts, some faculty had some part of their load assigned to faculty development. Generally too, there's a staff development coordinator under Academic Affairs. Candace suggested that we form an ad hoc committee who would come up with a more detailed procedure on how we can proceed. Cathy suggested a committee of two teaching faculty (Candace, Chuck Spotts), and two non-teaching faculty (Ron Marley, Maureen Stephens, and a counselor yet to be determined).

e. SLOs (No Attachment): *Ongoing work and discussion.*

Time ran out before we could cover this.

5. Other. Nothing else happened.

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

7. Next Meeting: 3:00 pm, November 14, in Room 1119.

