

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes

Date: 1/23/2017, 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 Whetstine (*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 11/28/16 Meeting**
 - a. The meeting was open to review the minutes from the last meeting.
 - b. Courtney Whetstine gave the group an update regarding item #3 from the minutes.
 - i. One of the current members from the Academic Reinstatement Committee has offered to go two years. As a result, the faculty staggering for this committee will begin next year.
 - c. **Stephanie André motioned to approve the minutes with no changes. Eddie Johnson seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.**
2. **Discussion Only: Review of Curriculum Committee Minutes from 11/29/16; 12/6/16; 1/17/17.**



- a. The meeting was open to review all of the minutes from the above listed Curriculum committee meetings.
 - b. The following items were discussed:
 - i. CCOG = Course Content and Outcomes Guide
 - ii. It was asked what processes are in place, other than reading Curriculum committee minutes, for departments to be aware of course changes in other programs that may affect their departments.
 1. The curriculum forms currently have a step built in to indicate what steps have been done to mitigate effects to other departments. These forms are signed by department Chairs, but may often be read as: "is this class a prerequisite?".
 2. CourseLeaf will have the function to insert FYI steps. This may be something to use moving forward to assist in communications.
 3. If there are recommendation on how to improve this process, the Curriculum committee would welcome the feedback.
3. **SECOND READING: Curriculum Committee Charge**
- a. The revised proposal was reviewed by the committee.
 - b. There were no additional questions or comments to the revised proposal.
 - c. **Dana Topliff motioned to approve the proposal for second reading with no changes. Stephanie André seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved.**
4. **FIRST READING: Grading Policy**
- a. A survey was given to faculty by all department Chairs, and the results were compiled and shared during a recent ChairMoot meeting. The results of this survey were handed out to the Academic Affairs committee for review. The following topics were discussed in relation to the survey:
 - i. The Library department was given as an example. Results from the survey showed two instructors using two separate grading scales. It was noted this may not be for the same course, but if it was, it would be of concern.
 - ii. The HHP department response was given as an example where a standard grading scale is "mostly" used by faculty.
 - iii. The survey showed there is no consistency across departments for offering other grades (i.e. A+, C-).
 - b. The below comments and questions were presented relating to the proposal:
 - i. Some benefits to COCC adopting a standard grading policy are:
 1. Students would have a clearly defined grading scale that would provide consistency from one instructor to the next.
 2. It would benefit new faculty. Determining their own grading scale would be one less concern.
 - ii. It was clarified that the proposal will be a policy change for the GP manual and not the college catalog.
 - iii. It was mentioned that the discussion in ChairMoot was based more on responses given, and not as much discussion on the topic.
 - iv. The idea of appointing a taskforce to work on the proposal was suggested, as there will be many things to consider. It was stated that this is not something the committee would want to rush through. The consensus from the group was



to commission a taskforce to review the topic and submit a final proposal to the Academic Affairs committee by Fall 2017.

1. It was indicated Math, Humanities, Nursing, Allied Health, and Paramedicine would all be departments that may need representation on the task force.
 2. It was commented that the taskforce may benefit from breaking out the procedural portions of the proposal from the policy portions.
 3. It was recommended that the taskforce have the ability to create their own charge.
 4. The idea of creating two taskforces to review the proposal was also discussed.
 - a. It was determined it would be best to appoint one taskforce and allow them the ability to make subgroups if needed.
 5. Courtney Whetstine, Eddie Johnson, and Dana Topliff volunteered to serve on the taskforce.
 6. **Stephanie André will ask her department for volunteers to sit on the committee.**
 7. **Tim Peterson will try to get a member from ASCOCC to be on the taskforce.**
 8. The Academic Affairs committee will finalize the makeup of the taskforce during the next committee meeting.
- c. Mara Kerr motioned to create a taskforce to review the Grading Policy proposal. Colette Hansen seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved creating a taskforce to review the Grading Policy proposal. The taskforce will be asked to submit a final proposal with their recommendations to the Academic Affairs committee by Fall 2017.**

5. FIRST READING: Promotions Committee Membership

- a. The Promotions committee is requesting to change the length in committee member assignments from two years to three. The proposal also includes adding language to indicate members should be able to fulfill their stint without going up for promotions.
- b. The following comments and questions were presented:
 - i. The change would improve the committee's overall knowledge/functionality on the Promotions process, as new members would be able to learn from more seasoned members of the committee.
 - ii. It was clarified that the number of representatives would not change, only the number of years a member serves.
 - iii. Does the timing of the added language make it difficult for new faculty to serve on the committee?
 - iv. The change may help ease concerns from faculty going up for Promotions.
 - v. A handout was presented giving different scenarios for staggering the committee members.
 - vi. The current committee makeup means there will be only one existing member serving on the committee next year. One goal of the proposal is to prevent this type of scenario from occurring again.
 - vii. Should there be one CTE and one Transfer faculty that are 3 years and one of each that are two?



1. The consensus of the group was that this recommendation would help provide the stability the Promotions committee needs.
2. Additional wording will be added to the matrix table to list the requirements of the positions clear.
- viii. The recommendation was made to change the wording on the first page of the proposal to state: "Faculty Chair Election: Chair to be elected annually by the committee at the end of their cycle."
- c. Dana Topliff motioned to approve the proposal with the changes recommended in the minutes. Stephanie André seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved for first reading.**

Eddie Johnson motioned to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:32pm.

Next Meeting: Monday, February 6, 2017 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m.