

**Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** 5/2/2016, Monday 3:30-4:30 PM

**Location:** Max Merrill Room, Library 221

**Present (voting members):**

Eddie Johnson (*Faculty Forum President Elect*)  
Tim Peterson (*Faculty at Large*)  
Colette Hansen (*Classified Rep*)  
Dana Topliff (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)  
Paula Simone (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)  
Jessica Russell (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)  
Jenni Newby (*VPI*)

**Absent (voting members):**

(*Student representative*)  
David Liu (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)

**Present (non-voting members):**

Eric Weller (*Note taker*)  
Vickery Viles (*Curriculum and Workforce Data Specialist*)  
Charlie Naffziger (*Department Chairs Representative*)  
Courtney Whetstine (*Registrar*)

**Absent (non-voting members):**

Laura Boehme (*IT Rep*)

**Guests**

Tony Russell (*Humanities*)

**Minutes:** (*Note: **Approvals and Action items** written in red.*)

1. **Review minutes from 4/18/16**

- a. The group was asked for comments on the draft minutes from last meeting.
- b. There were no questions or comments regarding the minutes.
- c. **Paula Simone motioned to approve the minutes from 4/4/16 with no changes. Jessica Russell seconded the motion. The voting members unanimously approved the minutes with no changes.**

2. **Review of Curriculum Committee minutes 4/12/16 – Discussion Only**

- a. The group discussed the Curriculum committee draft minutes from 3-15-16.
- b. The following topics were conversed regarding the minutes:
  - i. Curriculum review is almost complete for the year.
  - ii. The committee started conversations on their committee processes.
  - iii. The Curriculum committee will be recommending that a policy cut-off date be created for getting new student related policies into the next year's college catalog.
    1. The date would be sometime during winter term.
    2. This would be helpful for departments writing policies that impact students.

3. The proposal is in the process of being written.
4. The shared governance group is having similar conversations regarding deadlines.

3. **SECOND READING: Syllabus Policy**

- a. The syllabus policy was disbursed to different groups on the college campus. The following items were discussed by the committee:
  - i. Department chairs may need more time to review and provide feedback.
  - ii. Colette Hansen forwarded comments she already received to Tim.
  - iii. A faculty question was presented about the D grade on the syllabus template being set at 65%. – It was discussed that this is listed on the syllabus template as an example and instructor grades may vary. This opened up into a broader discussion on the grade policy. COCC's grade policy will be reviewed at a later time.
  - iv. Sharla Andresen received a reply from the lawyers regarding the syllabus as a contract. The reply was handed out to the committee and the below topics/questions were discussed.
    1. The letter indicates COCC's syllabus would be considered an expressed or implied contract. Additional language will need to be created if COCC would like the syllabus to not be considered a contract.
    2. Does the committee want to keep the language as it is?
    3. Would a lawyer be willing to come or call in to one of the meetings?
    4. The lawyers may not have full context of COCC's position on the syllabus.
    5. Students asking for tuition refunds or grade changes may be impacted by this.
    6. There will be follow up with the lawyers if the committee feels there is more need.
- b. **Tim will type up the additional statement to be included as suggested last meeting.**
- c. It was determined this will be tabled until the May 16, 2016 meeting.

4. **FIRST READING: Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee Proposal**

- a. The Learning Outcomes and Assessment taskforce submitted a proposal to transition the taskforce into a committee.
- b. The below questions and comments were discussed regarding the proposal.
  - i. It was clarified that the committee would commence work in the fall of 2016.-**Toni will update the proposal to reflect the timeline discussed.**
  - ii. Why is there a difference in terms for committee members? – This was designed to stagger the members to ensure there is a good mix of old and new members.
  - iii. Was there discussion on adding members to the committee other than faculty? – Yes, but it was decided not to.
  - iv. What is the purpose of the at large faculty? This may shift the outlook of the committee within different years. – It was discussed in the LOA taskforce that some of this sway may be desirable. At times there may be a greater need for focus in certain areas. It was felt that potential sway would be ok.
  - v. How are you going to collect and store learning evidence? – This will need to be defined.
  - vi. Has membership been selected for next year? – Some will retire from the taskforce, and some will carry on.
  - vii. It was mentioned that it may be difficult to fill 7 more spots on a committee. Some faculty may feel that it is difficult to get voted onto a committee, and some may feel they don't have as much to contribute to some committees.

- viii. Was there consideration for the positions to be appointed? – It was felt that this needs to be faculty determined and not determined by administration.
  - ix. Tony will be staying on the committee for another year.
  - x. Can department chairs seek out faculty and encourage them to run? – **Toni will provide a list of persons who might be invited to serve on LOA next year at the next meeting.**
  - xi. Academic Affairs could put out a request to faculty to encourage them to run.
  - xii. It was discussed that COCC's previous accreditation report indicates to scale back on committees, but this committee was felt by the group to be essential for COCC.
- c. **Dana Topliff motioned to approve the proposal for first reading. Colette Hansen seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved.**

5. **Academic Affairs 2016/2017 Chair Election**

- a. The committee discussed who could take on the task of committee chair for next year.
- b. Tim offered to stay on as chair for another year as this also aligns with work he is doing in the shared governance workgroup.
- c. **Dana Topliff motioned to elect Tim Peterson as committee chair. Jessica Russell seconded the motion. Tim was unanimously elected.**

6. **Academic Affairs Process: Academic Affairs Charge Review**

- a. Tim should be on the June College Affairs agenda to present the recommendations discussed at the last meeting. These items include:
  - i. Create a permanent position for CTE program director representation.
  - ii. Change the note take positions to a standing committee member position instead of a 1-year appointment.
  - iii. List all voting/non voting members in separate groups on the committee matrix.
- b. It was also discussed that a proposal will be made for the College Affairs committee to put items already passed by policy committees on a consent agenda rather than a separate agenda item.
  - i. This will help streamline the approval process for proposals presented to the College Affairs committee.
  - ii. Items on the consent agenda can be taken off for further discussion if the committee considers it necessary.

**Eddie Johnson motioned to adjourn the meeting. Paula Simone seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:31pm.**

**Next Meeting: Monday, May 16, 2016 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m.**