

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes

Date: 2/6/2017, 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*)

Betsy Julian (*VPI*)

Tim Peterson (*Faculty at Large*)

Jessica Russell (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)

Truman Merrifield (*Student representative*)

Absent (voting members):

Mara Kerr (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)

Dana Topliff (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)

Colette Hansen (*Classified Representative*)

Present (non-voting members):

Eric Weller (*Committee Specialist*)

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:

none

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

1. Ad Hoc Discussion:

- a. Truman Merrifield was announced as the ASCOCC student representative for the Academic Affairs committee. The committee went around the room and gave brief introductions.
- b. It was also announced that Mara Kerr will be resigning her position from the Academic Affairs committee.
 - i. **Tim will work with Eddie and Betsy to determine the appropriate steps to move forward with replacing the committee member position.**
 - ii. It was ask if there is a policy that Academic Affairs can appoint the position, or if it need to go up for election with the Faculty Forum.

iii. More information will be provided at the next meeting.

2. **Review Minutes from 1/23/17 Meeting**

- a. The meeting was open to review the minutes from January 23rd.
- b. There were no points of discussion brought forth.
- c. **Betsy Julian motioned to approved the minutes with no changes. Jessica Russell seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved with no changes.**

3. **Discussion Only: Review of Curriculum Committee Minutes from 1/24/17; 1/31/17.**

- a. The meeting was open to review all of the minutes from the above listed Curriculum committee meetings.
- b. There were no items further discussed from the minutes.

4. **SECOND READING: Promotions Committee Membership**

- a. The Faculty Promotions committee met and discussed the recommendations made by the Academic Affairs committee to the proposal. The following information was brought to the group from the discussion:
 - i. During the review of the recommendation to create some two and three year term positions, the Promotions committee noted that the current structure of the committee does not allow Assistant Professor II's to serve on the committee.
 - ii. Since the recommendation of requiring two year and three year terms to the committee makeup does not accomplish the intention of recommendation (allow for Assistant Professor II's to serve on the committee), the Promotions Committee felt like staying with the initial proposal, keeping all elected/appointed positions at three year terms, was appropriate.
 - iii. It was also discovered that the current committee make-up does not fit the current committee structure requirements.
 - iv. The Promotions committee discussed submitting a new transition plan if the Academic Affairs committee felt it was suitable.
 - v. The Promotions committee also voiced concern that the current structure does not allow for Assistant Professor II's to be include on the committee.
 - vi. The lack of consistency was of greatest concern to the Promotions committee.
- b. The following topics were discussed by the Academic Affairs committee after hearing what was discussed in the last Promotions committee meeting.
 - i. There was also concern that no Assistant Professor II's can serve on the Promotions committee with the current structure.
 1. It was expressed that this causes concerns that the committee may be too "top-heavy" with tenured faculty.
 - a. One concern mentioned was that senior faculty may have a different view on the promotions process than newer faculty.
 - ii. Creating a one-year term may be an option to consider.
 1. If this option was used, the pool of faculty each year would be very limited.
 - iii. It was mentioned that ensuring there is equal distribution amongst Associate and Professor faculty on the Promotions committee may be important to consider.



1. This was brought up in the Promotions committee discussion. However, the group did not feel it was of great concern.
 - iv. The Academic Affairs committee requested that the Promotions committee provide a new outline of their implementation steps.
 - v. It was also noted that the first reading recommendation to change the wording to state: "Faculty Chair Election: Chair to be elected annually by the committee at the end of their cycle" will be included in the revised proposal.
 - c. **Stephanie André motioned to table the proposal until an outline is provided with the transition steps and the wording adjustment recommended during the first reading. Jessica Russell seconded the motion. The committee unanimously agreed to table the proposal.**
5. **TABLED: Grading Policy**
- a. It was announced that Ken Swartwout, and Rebecca Walker-Sands will be added to the Grading Policy taskforce.
 - b. It was asked if a student will be included on the committee.
 - i. It had been discussed that taking this to the Student Affairs Committee would be a better approach to obtaining student involvement.
 - c. Eddie Johnson and Courtney Whetstine will move forward with setting meetings for the taskforce.
 - d. The Academic Affairs committee will check in with the taskforce moving forward. The topic will stay on the agenda's moving forward to allow the taskforce to provide updates to the committee.
6. **FIRST READING: Curriculum Standards Procedure**
- a. It was discussed that the proposal submitted is to acknowledge there will be a set of curriculum standards updated each year by the curriculum department. The proposal is not to approve what those standards will be.
 - b. The proposal recommends that the curriculum standards are maintained in curriculum department and changes are reviewed by the curriculum committee and communicated to the college each year.
 - c. The current draft of curriculum standards is going to the CTE council later in the week for additional feedback.
 - d. **Betsy Julian motioned to approve the proposal for first reading. Stephanie André seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved for first reading with no changes.**
7. **FIRST READING: Course Standards Statement and Course Outline**
- a. The group was provided and overview of the proposal.
 - i. Course outlines are like the "baseball card" stats of a course.
 - ii. It was stated that most schools have course outlines that are accessible to students.
 - iii. The proposal is to approve the concept of requiring a course outline for all classes, as well as what information will be required on the course outline.
 - b. The proposal provided an example of what a COCC Course Outline may look like. The following items were reviewed and discussed by the committee:



- i. Most of the informational items on the example are fields that can be pulled from data already existing in banner. However, there will be some fields that departments need to submit information for.
 - ii. Learning Outcomes
 1. This field is not currently published and is required to be. The course outline may be a place to accomplish this requirement.
 - iii. Content Outline
 1. These used to be from the syllabi.
 2. This would be a location to put topics not included on a course outcome.
 3. Some departments may choose to include more detail in this field than others.
 - iv. Required Materials
 1. Information included in this field may be information such as if the course requires the student to provide a bike, kitchen knives from the bookstore, etc.
 - v. Assessment Methods
 1. This is not intended to be a limiting statement, but a request to give students an idea on what they can expect from the course. However, departments can choose to use this to limit options if they wish.
 - a. Writing and Science classes were given as examples.
 2. Departments will determine how this field is written.
 - vi. The course outline may be a place to quickly edit some aspects of courses without them needing to go through curriculum.
 - vii. There has been concern voiced about how much work this will add to departments.
 - viii. It was asked where this information would be kept.
 1. A specific location has not been determined, but it would be somewhere on the web. In the meantime, an Argos report can be created to capture the information.
 - ix. Creating course outlines would greatly help transcript degree evaluation in the Admissions department.
 - x. It was asked if there will be a link from the course description.
 1. It was discussed that this may be ideal, but COCC will need to determine what location make work best for our systems.
 - xi. Some additional fields that COCC could decide to include are:
 1. Grade Mode
 2. Course Fee
 - xii. Would this go to the hard copy of the catalog?
 1. This would not be included in the college catalog. It would be kept separate.
 - xiii. Is this something that would be added to the curriculum committee's process?
 1. The information needed for a course outline would be built in to the CourseLeaf forms that will be reviewed by the Curriculum committee.
- c. **Betsy Julian motioned to approve the proposal for first reading with no changes. Stephanie André seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the proposal for first reading.**

Eddie Johnson motioned to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:33pm.

Next Meeting: Monday, February 20, 2017 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m.