Members Present: Mark Renner, Dave Bazard, Peter Blakemore, Steve Brown, Dan Calderwood, Mike Cox, John Johnston, Philip Mancus (by phone), Richard Ries (by phone), Sandra Rowan, Chris Vicory, Keith Snow-Flamer, Jerred Scheive
Members Absent: Bob Brown, Kady Dunleavy, Marcy Foster, Laura Mays

1. Call to Order: Co-President Renner called the meeting to order at 1:08 pm.

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Co-President Renner welcomed the Senate and audience and asked for public comments. Pru Ratliff thanked the Senate and faculty for their involvement in her Middle School events. She knows it is difficult but fun and she couldn’t do it without faculty, who make a big difference in student’s lives. She read a letter from a student who was particularly happy about having participated in “I enrolled in college”. No other comments were forwarded.

3. Approve the March 7, 2014 Meeting Minutes: On a motion by Sandra Rowan, seconded by Dave Bazard, the minutes were approved as written.

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve AP and IB scores revisions: Erin Wall

   4.1.1 On a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Dan Calderwood, the AP scores revisions were discussed. Erin Wall commented that a few changes will bring us into better alignment with other CSUs and community colleges. Changes were made in Math/Statistics, Calculus and Foreign Languages scores. Jay Dragten responded to an email with comments regarding comparing our stats to other schools; C2 GE credit is generally held to a higher degree. An amendment proposed by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Dave Bazard was to “amend the AP Credit Hour document to include 3 units of 2C Humanities credits for students who receive a “4” upon examination”. The amended language was approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y. Then, with more discussion, a roll call vote was taken and the document was approved with the amendment included: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y.

   4.1.2 On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Peter Blakemore, the action item for the IB scores was discussed, which how Senate was concerned, how students now must verify with the transfer school whether what is listed is actual for that college, and whether specific courses should be listed on the IB table the way they are on the AP table. We don’t want to shortchange the students in IB pathways where the AP is more specific. Erin will go back and ask about the specifics. A typo and an addition to language: English A1, A2 / the CSU GE Area should be “A2”, not “C2”; and adding a comma and “such as CSU and UC,” should be added to the last sentence under International Baccalaureate (IB) Credits right after the word “institution”. Specifying courses as they do at HSU will be researched in order to best serve the students (it could be an
Advising/Counseling matter), but as it stands will suffice at this time. It was recommended that Senators take the matter back to their constituents in order to further modify for next year. The document was approved by the following roll call: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y.

4.2 Approve March 14 (motion/second: Peter Blakemore/Chris Vicory) and March 28 (motion/second: Dave Bazard/Peter Blakemore) Curriculum Committee Recommendations, George Potamianos: there were no problems and the recommendations were approved by separate roll call vote for each committee document: March 14 - Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y. And March 28: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y. It was noted that per a document approved at Senate previously, a CIS 1 course is now approved for GE status.

4.3 Approve Curriculum Committee “Proposal for Distance Education Course” Form Draft: George Potamianos: Motion/Second: unsure/unsure Mark Winter presented the item and noted that Title 5 and ACCJC standards are embedded in the document. It will become part of the curriculum process if approved. He explained the three methods in #4. A lot of discussion around #6 and the possibility of amending the question to trigger the 50% warning more clearly and succinctly (besides changing the “of” to “or”). There are monitors that keep watch over courses, and there are several triggers that heighten the 50% problem. The first amendment forwarded (motion/second: Dave Bazard/Steve Brown) was to add “or will it cause the course to go over the 50% mark…”). Could the current “Stoplight” become the “Substantive Change Thermometer”? Instead of having faculty try to come up with the percentage (which is not easy), the curriculum committee, Mark Winter, et. al., are keeping an eye out for DE thresholds. With further discussion, the amendment was retracted and a new amendment was proposed (motion/second: Peter Blakemore/John Johnston) that is meant to sensitize instructors to be on the lookout for that 50% compliance. #6 would read “Will approval of this course offer a certificate or degree program with 50% or more of its curriculum delivered by distance education?” The amendment was approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y. And with no more discussion, the amended form draft was approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y.

4.4 Approve Curriculum Committee “Non-Substantial Changes to Approved Program or Change of Active-Inactive Status” Form: On a motion to approve by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Dave Bazard, George Potamianos introduced this Chancellor’s office change (asking for different/more detailed information). The matrix on page 2 is different than the previous narrative format. This format gives submitters the chance to answer specific questions during the submission process instead of Curriculum support having to email applicants for answers. The proposed changes were approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; S. Brown – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Johnston – y; Mancus – y; Ries – y; Rowan – y; Vicory – y.

5. Discussion Items
5.1 Curriculum Proposal for Distance Education Substantive Change in Degree or
Certificate: Mark Renner and George Potamianos offered Mark Winter as presenter, again. He explained that an outcome of the Substantive Change Task Force was to establish an internal approval process that brings a potential 50% threshold program to the attention of Curriculum Committee members highlighting the rationale for being above 50% and to make the program a part of the regular program review process. It will also help with identifying that courses have been approved and whether adequate instructional support is available. Deans will be responsible for completing the form. The broader picture is that the DE Committee will be able to generate a list of DE certified faculty. The question of “Certification” vs. “Qualification” came up. The intent is to know who has gone through the certification process. The processes for certification/qualification are going through discussion in ASPC and College Council at this time, and developing AP 4105 Distance Education and other DE processes are ongoing. A question about instructors who’ve been teaching online already is still being discussed, but they do not intend to “grandfather-in” current online faculty because some have been “thrown in” to online teaching (as well as other factors); however, it should not be onerous to be deemed qualified or to be certified, and there is no intention to block faculty from teaching. The goal is to ensure quality instruction no matter the delivery method. Everyone will be required to be certified, but the process for certification has not been finalized. Next year will be a transition year (2014-15).

5.2 New Notations of Repeats on Class Rosters: Mark Renner and Keith Snow-Flamer: WebAdvisor would (if approved) have a new notation. The idea, which came from a faculty member, was if they could be informed of how many times a student has repeated a course by a notation on the class roster. Discussion included:

- Would there be a grade-bias?
- Student confidentiality compromise?
- Could be worthwhile to have this triggering mechanism so instructors/counselors could help students make an informed decision.
- It may prejudice the faculty against the student?
- It is already a requirement before trying to get a third repeat by petitioning to advising/counseling, which then gets kicked to a committee (financial aid, perhaps, and then Keith makes the final decision).
- Clarify process for getting a third try.
- Now it is just a flag for a repeat; would this show how many times they’ve repeated?
- The faculty may then be able to make the student aware of the consequences of failing the third time.
- FA has concerns as they can only get money (apportionment) for TWO tries
- Repeatability confines
- Legality of it; they have received a grade
- Faculty have an educational need to know?
- Will this be brought back on April 18 for action?

Good discussion!

5.3 Matriculation and Educational Pathway Task Force Recommendations: Keith Snow-Flamer presented. The original task force broke up into two parts last December (Educational and Matriculation). From the Educational Pathway Task force: How do we handle future ADTS? What criteria do we use to guide decision-making efforts? What do we do with current [approximately 80] ADTs, and do we need more or less than we currently have? And from the Matriculation Task Force: How do we recruit/outreach to students? How do we follow students through outreach, recruitment, course selection, and through the first year? Can we put in place block
scheduling? Which courses could a student link to in order to be successful? Once it gets approved through Senate we would begin to demonstrate how to use it by Fall of 2015. Dave Bazard mentioned that the flowchart would help a student realize what they need in order to finish their degrees. We don’t want to have students “meandering” through their courses.

5.4 General Education Dialogue Group Findings: Dave Bazard the group met Jan. 18. The GE Outcomes are summarized in the handout. Summary #1: Reading comprehension and college level writing are required for GE courses and can be a barrier for students to achieve. Should all courses that qualify as a GE course have a recommendation of English 150? Currently about 80% of courses do have that recommendation, but there are some that don’t. The consensus was that if a course is to be designated as GE, then the recommended prep would always be ENG 150. Summary #2: The Senate has now passed a multicultural understanding proposal that covers part of this suggestion (see discussion in Feb. 21 minutes, and approval in March 7 minutes). The outcomes should be evaluated. Summary #3: The bulleted lists were derived a while ago and done rapidly, and some may not now accurately describe the intent of the outcome. So the suggestion would be to review all the lists in the descriptions of outcomes, especially the Global/Cultural Context outcomes. Comments included:

- The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) ad-hoc group have been discussing critical thinking, reading and writing and could be considered a partial response to assessments. Critical thinking should be taught across the disciplines, not just in English classes.
- We have to be careful in terminology; ENG150 would be a recommended prep, not a requirement.
- George Potamianos was worried if English 150 was the best barometer of whether a student can read or write sufficiently for college level courses. Dave responded that the policies we have steer people to make decisions based on their comfort level for reading and writing. The placement tests can be less than perfect.
- The English dept. has reassessed placement and we were found to be higher than other places.
- How best to bring this back as an action item in two weeks?
- “Requiring” would be fine but there is concern that it would make their course unpalatable (“stick out like a sore thumb”) so “recommended prep” is a better path.
- If the Curriculum Committee cannot pass things without ENG 150 as recommended prep, it may create tensions. The suggestion is to take this recommendation back to your constituents to discuss it between now and when you need to vote in two weeks!
- Who would get the bulleted list for GE outcomes? An ad-hoc exists but not a standing committee.

6. Reports:

6.1 Reference Desk Assessment Report: Ruth Moon provided a document and went over it and will be happy to get feedback. Many instructional faculty do not realize the scope of the materials available at the CR library. The scholarship of our library is very much at a college level! Our library is meeting outcomes.

6.2 ACCJC Special Budget Report: Lee Lindsey not present; everyone has access to it, so please do read it; take feedback to constituent groups.
6.3 Distance Education Substantive Change Update: Jeff Cummings – the ACCJC Substantive Change Committee is meeting May 8, with proposal submitted 30 days previous. Our draft report will be reviewed by Susan Clifford (chair of that committee) and we’ll then use her input to revise a bit (or not submit it at all). Will we actually submit now or hold till Fall? There are still lots of holes in the machinery because of all the challenges of accurately articulating our DE policy. We’ve worked very hard to get where we are, but all of the components just aren’t in place, yet.

6.4 LMS Task Force Update: Lisa Sayles and Angelina Hill: Well underway with three meetings and extensive research. Faculty survey and student survey going out today. Narrowed down some different LMS systems, shooting for Friday, April 18 to participate in a demo of systems. Really do want to move it along and get all feedback. Generating a set of criteria for a matrix to help evaluate the systems. Hope to make a final selection by end of term in May. IT has suggested that we need to get on top of it as a sustainability issue. Mark thanked them all for all the work; CRFO, Senate and administration appreciate the way you are doing it and invited the senators to hound colleagues to click the link and take the survey!!! One for associates, another for full time to see if there are any big discrepancies.

6.5 ASCR Update: Jerred Scheive: ASCR has created an ad-hoc committee to ensure that bylaws meet requirements, especially CR policy; the annual Leadership awards dinner is coming up; ASCR officer candidates are confirmed for 2014-15, so tell your students to VOTE!!

6.6 Board of Trustees April 1 Meeting Update: Mark Renner reported that the meeting went quick with little discussion except about BOT health benefits. Lot of concern by BOT over agenda item 4.6 (Curriculum recommendations) concerning discontinuation of courses, but they passed with dissent; Keith remarked that the BOT is still struggling with their roll in curriculum and what they should/shouldn’t be suggesting for courses. There were attendees from Mendocino at this Del Norte meeting.

6.7 College Council March 31 Meeting Update: Keith Snow-Flamer; the committee moved forward a few policies; BP/AP 2345 Evaluation of President/Superintendent, interim AP 4021 Program Revitalization and Discontinuance, AP/BP 7400 Travel will all be forwarded to the Board; there are also several policies to sunset.

6.8 College Update: Keith Snow-Flamer: Instructional Council to look at potential programs to put through the AP 4021 process. He will talk to Copresidents next week.

7. Announcements and Open Forum
7.1 Portugal Awards – interviews will be held April 11; five applicants
7.2 Upcoming CR Events: Steve Brown reported that some technical programs will be getting a visit from the accreditors to validate their self-study next week. He believes they’re prepared and that the processes for accreditation for the whole college helped the CTE with their program accreditation.

8. Adjournment: On a motion by Dan Calderwood, seconded by Chris Vicory, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 pm.
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Next Meeting:
Friday, April 18, 2014