Academic Senate
MINUTES
Monday, September 12, 2016
3:00 – 4:45 p.m.
Room 1108

Executive Committee Members Present

|   | Cathy Anderson |   | Kate Ashbey |   | Keith Brookshaw |
|---|----------------|---|-------------|---|-----------------
| x | Toni Cancilla  | x | Katy Cottrell | x | James Crockett |
| x | Leo Fong       | x | Keith Foust  | x | Lenore Frigo   |
| x | Kathryn Gessner|x | Scott Gordon | x | Karen Henderson|
| x | Jennifer McCandless|x | Susan Meacham | x | Ray Nicholas |
| x | Carolyn Salus-Singh|x | Brian Spillane | x | Linda Thomas |
| x | Joanne Tippin  | x | Terry Turner | x | Susan Westler |

|   | Don Cingrani (N/V) |   | Ron Marley (N/V) |   | Peggy Moore (N/V) |

Other Faculty Present


Guests

|   | Will Breitbach |   | Tim Johnston | x | Kate Mahar |


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

2. Approval of Minutes (Attachment) August 22, 2016: Cathy Anderson pointed out that Katy Cottrell’s name was mistakenly spelled as “Kelly Cottrell” in the Executive Committee Members
list and needed to be corrected. Kate Ashbey moved to approve the minutes with the correction; seconded by Jennifer McCandless. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Opportunity for Public Comment
   a. 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. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

4. Reports
   a. Report from the Academic Senate President (Cathy Anderson)
      i. Cathy noted that the Brown Act specifies that individual votes that are abstentions and no votes needed to be recorded in the minutes. This practice should also apply to the minutes of the Senate’s standing subcommittees, and Cathy will contact those committees to remind them of this.
   b. Report from Instructional Council (Susan Meacham)
      i. No report.
   c. Report from College Council (Peggy Moore or Cathy Anderson)
      i. Cathy sent out via email the report from the last College Council meeting.
   d. Reports from Standing Subcommittees (Reports are given by the Co-Chair or delegate as needed)
      i. Curriculum Council (Co-Chair: Ron Marley)
         1. No report.
      ii. Scholastic Standards Committee (Co-Chair: Don Cingrani)
          1. No report.
      iii. Faculty Excellence Committee (Co-Chair: Cliff Gottlieb)
          1. No report.
      iv. SLO Committee (Co-Chair: Sara McCurry)
          1. No report.
      v. General Education Committee (Co-Chair: Carolyn Borg)
          1. No report.
   e. Reports from Joint Committees (Reports are given by the Co-Chair or delegate as needed)
      i. Distance Education Committee (Co-Chair: Anthony Eckhart)
         1. No report.
      ii. Student Success Committee (Co-Chair: Teresa Doyle)
          1. No report.
   f. Reports from Affiliate Committees (Reports are given by the Co-Chair or delegate as needed)
      i. Textbook Committee (Co-Chair: Heather Wylie)
         1. No report.

5. Informational Items
   a. Update on By-laws Revision--Susan Meacham (no attachment)
      i. Cathy stated that she and Susan will bring a draft of recommended changes to the By-laws to the next meeting. This will be a first reading. Changes to the By-laws require three readings before a vote can be taken.
b. BP/AP 5012--Due to the several suggested changes received, Frank Nigro will be making changes before our first reading. The first reading is postponed until the next meeting.

6. Discussion/Action items
   a. Online STOTs--Kate Mahar (no attachment)
      We are invited to give input on some ideas that might make the process to collect STOTs more efficient. This is not a conversation about the content of STOTs or any other contract issue.
      i. Kate Maher explained that the goal of doing STOTs online was to make the process more efficient than the current method of having students complete the printed surveys during class time; in particular, there are concerns with confidentiality as the print STOT forms are viewed and handled by multiple individuals. Kate Ashbey asked about the comparison between response rates for classroom-administered STOTs versus STOTs administered online. Kate agreed that this would be important to know about, but such data is currently unavailable. Will Breitbach noted that there are ways to encourage students to complete the STOT form through Canvas; for example, students can be reminded of this every time they log onto Canvas. Kate wanted to get more data on these matters to help with our decision on if and how we can change the process for administering STOTs.
   b. Tenure Review Committees (1 attachment)
      Article 5.5.2.2 of our faculty contract gives the Academic Senate responsibility for approving all tenure review committees.
      i. Cathy Anderson pointed out that the spelling of Kate Ashbey’s name on the list needed to be corrected. Susan Meacham moved to approve the list with the correction; seconded by Terry Turner. Motion carried unanimously.
   c. Peer Evaluators (1 attachment)
      Article 5.10.1.1 of our faculty contract gives the Academic Senate responsibility for approving all peer reviewers for part time faculty.
      i. This is a list of proposed peer evaluators who are not tenured faculty. Tony Oso and Janet Janis are supervisors, so they are on this list for approval. Ray Nicholas moved to approve the list of peer evaluators; seconded by Jennifer McCandless. Ray explained that although Tony Oso is a supervisor, he is one of the few in the BAITS division qualified to do peer evaluations in the area of Fire Technology. Karen Henderson and Scott Gordon stated that Janet Janis is the interim director of the new HIM program, and there are currently no full-time faculty in that program; both pointed out that she has unique expertise in this area. Linda Thomas requested advice on whether Brian Busk should be doing a peer evaluation during the first year of his tenure review process, and she noted that there is a potential for conflict of interest because he would be evaluating a co-teacher; Linda also added that she would be willing to do the peer evaluation that Brian had volunteered to do. Jennifer McCandless withdrew her seconding of the motion. Ray Nicholas noted that Rick Osbrink is also in his first year of the tenure review process, but he felt confident that Rick would be able to do the evaluation; he argued that doing peer evaluations is valuable experience, and first-year faculty are more than qualified to do them. Jennifer requested that faculty take a closer look at this practice of first-year probationary faculty taking on the role of peer evaluator. Jennifer McCandless moved to approve this list
with the exception of Brian Busk and Rick Osbrink because both are in the first year of their tenure review process; seconded by Susan Meacham. Motion carried unanimously.

ii. Cathy sent out an email listing peer evaluators for counselors. Terry Turner moved to approve Michelle Saelee serving as peer evaluator for Mike O’Leary; seconded by Brian Spillane. Motion carried with one abstention by Jennifer McCandless.

iii. Scott Gordon moved to approve Tim Johnston and Sue Loring serving as peer evaluators for Mindy Marlatt, who is full-time but not tenure-track; seconded by Ray Nicholas. Motion carried unanimously.

iv. Jennifer McCandless moved to approve Tim Johnston and Brian Spillane serving as peer evaluators for Sonia Randhawa, who is full-time but not tenure-track. Motion carried unanimously.

d. Delegate (no attachment)

From Article III of the Academic Senate by-laws: Section 2 - The Delegate of the Academic Senate shall be appointed by the Executive Committee from the membership of the full time faculty. Section 3 - The Delegate shall serve for a term of one semester. Kate Ashbey is volunteering to be appointed Delegate for the spring semester.

i. Scott Gordon moved to approve Kate Ashbey as Delegate for Spring Semester; seconded by Terry Turner. Motion carried unanimously.

ii. Cathy asked for volunteers to serve as Delegate this Fall Semester.

e. Mentors; Review Language in Contract--Cathy Anderson (no attachment)

Article 5.5.1 of the faculty contract: “Each probationary unit member serving under his/her first contract shall be assigned a mentor. A mentor may be assigned to the probationary unit member during the second and third contracts when requested by either the Individual Tenure Review or the Institutional Tenure Review Committee. The Vice President of Academic Affairs shall have the authority to assign a mentor during the second and/or third contract years.”

i. Cathy wanted to give Faculty Association input on clarifying the Contract language concerning who can serve as a mentor to probationary faculty and whether mentors need to be approved by the Senate in the same way that Tenure Review Committee members are. She pointed out that in the current Contract there is no explicit mention of the mentor being a faculty member, nor is there any explicit mention of Senate approval of mentors. Terry Turner proposed that we add these two requirements: Mentors should be both full-time and tenured faculty members, and the appointment of mentors for probationary faculty members’ first year be approved by the Senate. Ray Nicholas expressed concern that such requirements might be too restrictive because in some departments there are not enough full-time, tenured faculty eligible to serve as mentors. Peggy Moore suggested that the Contract language explicitly specify that the mentor cannot be also serving on the probationary faculty member’s Tenure Review Committee; when Cathy checked on this, she was not able to find anything in the Contract that stated this, so such language should be added. Cathy stated that she would send these recommendations to Faculty Association. There was additional discussion about whether Senate approval of mentors is needed beyond the first year of the tenure review process; these situations typically involve the VP of Instruction appointing a mentor, and there are issues of confidentiality that can come into play when
this happens. Because of this, requiring Senate approval could prove to be problematic.

7. Other?
   a. Cathy spoke about the SLO Committee as a subcommittee of the Faculty Excellence Committee (FEC). She wanted to propose the idea of creating a new position of Faculty Development Coordinator (FDC). Cliff Gottlieb is planning to resign as co-chair of the FEC, so Cathy is proposing that the FEC co-chair and SLO Coordinator positions be combined into a single position of FDC. Lenore Frigo argued against this because of the large workload and broad responsibilities this position would have. Susan Westler saw the two positions as having different goals, so it wouldn’t make sense to combine the two. Cathy asked if we should be asking for a FDC that would be a completely separate position. This had more support from Senate members, so she said she would pursue this proposal further.

8. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

9. Next meeting: Monday, September 26 at 3:00 p.m.

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.