

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes

Date: 11/28/2016, Monday 3:30-4:30 PM

Location: Max Merrill Room, Library 221

Present (voting members):

Eddie Johnson (*Faculty Forum President*)
Stephanie André (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)
Colette Hansen (*Classified Representative*)
Dana Topliff (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)
Betsy Julian (*VPI*)
Tim Peterson (*Faculty at Large*)
Mara Kerr (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)

Absent (voting members):

Jessica Russell (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)
(*Student representative*)

Present (non-voting members):

Eric Weller (*Note taker*)
Vickery Viles (*Director of Curriculum & Assessment*)
Ralph Phillips (*ChairMoot Chair Elect*)
Brian Bubak (*CTE Representative*)
Courtney Whetstone (*Director of Admissions & Registrar*)
Jeff Floyd (*IT Representative*)

Absent (non-voting members):

All present

Guests:

Jessica Giglio (*Math*)

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

1. **Review Minutes from 10/31/16 Meeting**
 - a. The meeting was open to review the minutes from the last meeting.
 - b. Update from Tim: The committee matrix is now up to date on the web.
 - c. **Colette Hansen motioned to approve the minutes from 10/31/16, Stephanie André seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved with no changes.**

2. **Discussion Only: Review of Curriculum Committee Minutes from 11/8/16**
 - a. Erika Wooler will be replacing Lisa Bacon as Curriculum Committee Specialist.
 - b. There were no additional comments or questions about the minutes.

3. **SECOND READING: Academic Reinstatement Committee**
 - a. Questions from the previous meeting were reviewed:
 - i. There used to be two people in the transfer position and possibly two in CTE, has this changed?
 1. This change was driven by the volume of requests received. The volume is less now compared to previous years.
 - ii. Should the two-year Faculty Forum appointments be staggered?
 1. Courtney will follow up with this after the proposal has been approved through Academic Affairs. She will check with the existing committee members to determine staggering.
 - b. **Betsy Julian motioned to approve the proposal for second reading. Dana Topliff seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved.**
4. **Ad Hoc Discussion (Approval Process)**
 - a. Proposals approved through Academic Affairs no longer require approval from College Affairs to go into the General Procedures manual. This process was recently changed.
 - b. Once the president approves a Committee Recommendation form, a copy of this form will be given to Erika Waldbillig to be updated in the GP manual.
5. **Discussion Only: Grading Policy**
 - a. Eddie provided the group feedback received from ChairMoot and CTE Council on a grading policy/scale. Some of the topics discussed with the groups included: maintaining a D grade, adding an A+ grade, and the C- grade.
 - i. The department responses received at ChairMoot were mixed. There was not one straightforward consensus.
 - ii. It was noted that faculty may have been looking at the proposal from the perspective of do they want a change.
 - iii. The grading scale presented on the new syllabus template was a topic of discussion.
 - iv. Some faculty do not use +/- grades.
 - v. "Academic Freedom" was a topic brought up.
 - vi. One group opposed to using a set grading scale was the CTE programs. Many programs have external factors related to accreditation.
 - vii. ChairMoot took a vote on moving forward a mandatory grading scale and voted against it. The group will further discuss the topics of a D grade, A+ grade, and the C- grade.
 - b. Eddie will submit a proposal to the committee, but will wait to hear more from faculty before submitting.
 - c. The additional questions and comments were brought up during the meeting:
 - i. Student feedback will be important to obtain. Eddie will contact ASCOCC to see if they can conduct a survey for students on the grading policy. Tim will contact Shannon Waller about bringing this topic to the Student Affairs committee.
 - ii. Some departments identified inconsistencies in grading practices within their groups.
 - iii. When searching "grading policy" on the web, nothing comes up.
 - iv. What is the grading scale for an A grade at PCC?
 1. A grades are fairly consistent (90%-100%). The only school reviewed that has an A+ grade is Lane Community College.



- v. It will be important to distinguish “grading scale” vs “grading policy” in the notes and in discussions moving forward.
- vi. Is there a downside to having an institutional policy?
- vii. If instructors want to try new teaching methods in class, this may affect the grading scale. Some may grade on a curve if they are trying something new.
- viii. Some instructors have inherited grading scales from other instructors.
- ix. Do EMS students have an understanding of the grading scale used in the program?
 - 1. Students know the first day of class what they need to get to pass.
- x. A well written policy can take different grading scale requirements for different programs into account.
- xi. One inconsistency presented was different sections of the same class offering different grading scales (i.e. 76% being offered as a B in one class 86% in another).
- xii. Will the proposal recommend a consistent grading scale?
 - 1. The proposal will likely use the scale given on the syllabus template, but it will depend on additional feedback received.
- xiii. Would it be good to have a position description that describes the current policy and some of the talking points?
 - 1. Vickery will work on a position description for the topic and provide it to Eddie.

6. FIRST READING: Curriculum Committee Charge

- a. Changing the charge of the Curriculum Committee was recently discussed in College Affairs. It was determined Academic Affairs would approve the change in charge of to its subcommittees.
- b. The following topics were discussed from the proposal:
 - i. It was recommended that #1, e from the handout be changed to state: Course and Program *Titles* and descriptions.
 - ii. It was recommended Instructional Deans’ Administrative Assistant should be changed to *Instructional Systems Specialist* under Membership, Voting Status, and Terms the Instructional Deans’.
 - iii. Topic # 3 was discussed from the handout.
 - 1. How would this differ from not just making corrections, but also supporting?
 - iv. Topic # 4 was also discussed from the handout.
 - 1. Comment: This may be more of a role for Academic Affairs instead of Curriculum.
 - 2. Comment: Perhaps add some language that items may be referred to AA if necessary.
 - 3. Comment: With changes in prerequisites, it will be important to notify the impacts of changes to the classes.
 - 4. Comment: This is a fundamental thing that Curriculum does. AA may look at the system level, and Curriculum at the proposal level.
- v. Question: Who is responsible for creation of new focus areas and sun setting areas? If applicable, should it be written in the charge?



- c. Stephanie André motioned to approve the proposal with the minor changes recommended. Eddie Johnson Seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved for first reading.**

Eddie Johnson motioned to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:36pm.

Next Meeting: Monday, January 9, 2016 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m. – *December 12th meeting will be canceled.*