

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes

Date: 1/25/2016, Monday 3:30-4:30 PM

Location: Max Merrill Room, Library 221

Present (voting members):

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

Absent (voting members):

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

Present (non-voting members):

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

Absent (non-voting members):

Laura Boehme (*IT Rep*)

Guests

Dawn Lane (*Nursing*)
Chris Rubio (*Humanities*)

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

1. **Review minutes from 1/11/16**
 - a. The meeting was open for questions on the minutes for 1/11/16.
 - b. **Paula Simone motioned to approve the minutes from 1/11/16 with no changes. David Liu seconded the motion. The voting members unanimously approved the minutes with no changes.**
2. **Review of Curriculum Committee minutes – Discussion Only**
 - a. It was discussed that program termination guidelines will come up for second reading at the next Curriculum Committee meeting. There has been a form and guidelines approved for first reading.
 - b. Several programs will use the new process once approved.
3. **FIRST READING: Nursing Assistant Certification Proposal**
 - a. Dawn Lane presented an overview of the proposal. The following information was presented and discussed:
 - i. In 2014-2015 the Nursing program was required to make changes to the program. As a result, some of the changes caused unintended consequences.



- ii. One unintended consequence was that it caused financial aid eligibility issues for students pursuing a nursing assistant certification. It costs students \$1400 out of pocket to pursue this program, as it is not financial aid eligible.
- iii. St. Charles has also been impacted by these changes. They have had difficulty filling nursing assistant positions because they have not received enough qualified applicants.
- iv. Creating a nursing assistant certificate program is a way to help resolve the issues.
- v. One goal is to get Certified Nursing Assistant 1's and Certified Nursing Assistant 2's out into the community. Another goal is to make CNA1/CNA2 classes financial aid eligible for students.
- vi. The program will be 9 months long.
- vii. There would be a lab fee with this program to help pay for student testing.
- viii. No new classes need to be developed for the program.
- b. It was discussed that if no response is made, there may become an issue for the community.
- c. It was clarified that students completing NUR 95 and NUR 96 can still become certified(CNA1 and CNA2), but have the option to complete the entire certificate through COCC.
- d. Certification for CNA 1 and CNA 2 is done through state testing. As a result, the timing of when the program is run will need to ensure that students are able to complete state testing on time.
- e. It was discussed that Registered Nursing Assistants have been getting paid to do CNA work because there are not enough CNA's in the community. The shortage has driven up CNA pay by about \$1/hour.
- f. It was presented that the question for COCC may be: should a program that is financial aid eligible be created for certified nursing assistants, or should it continue to be offered through classes that are not financial aid eligible?
- g. It was discussed that the demographic of nursing students is changing.
- h. The CNA 1 class is currently a credit class that is not financial aid eligible. The CNA 2 class is currently a non-credit class that is not financial aid eligible.
- i. The CNA 2 class is in the college catalog but has not been offered for some time.
- j. It was discussed that the new certificate should not have a negative impact to the nursing program. It may help add interest for it.
- k. Would anyone new need to be hired? – Not currently, but it may depend on how many students are interested in the program. 24 students may be the optimum number. If it grew to 30 students staffing would be needed, or the program potentially limited.
- l. Math and Writing requirements for the program were reviewed.
- m. **Dana Topliff motioned to approve the proposal for first reading with no changes. Colette Hansen seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved.**

4. Changes to Learning Communities Committee Charge – Discussion

- a. It was discussed that the College Affairs committee will have the final decision on changing the committees charge. It is being reviewed because the proposal would cause the taskforce to be under the Academic Affairs committee.
- b. The meeting was open to questions and discussion regarding the proposal. The following topics were brought up:
 - i. The title of the committee may best fit under the Ad-Hoc committee category.
 - ii. What does the Learning Communities committee see the group doing in the future?
 - iii. The application process for learning communities was discussed.
 - iv. Learning communities often don't get filled by students. It can be discouraging to spend time prepping for a class that does not fill.
 - v. If the campus would like to have approval on applications for learning communities the committee would be happy to continue in this role.

- vi. There was discussion around the administrative support mentioned in the proposal.
- vii. The learning communities discussion started under prior leadership and involved OSU Cascades as well as COCC. Is there no longer interest that extends between both schools?
- viii. It can be very expensive to facilitate learning communities.
- ix. There are various reasons that students do not sign up for these classes.
- x. There was no compensation for added work for learning communities other than the first round.
- xi. It was expressed that some don't want to see learning communities go away.
- xii. There is a Load Assessment Workgroup looking at load it may be good to bring up compensation issues with this committee.
- xiii. It was asked if students staying in the dorms have been looked at as a group for learning communities.
- xiv. It communicated that there is hesitancy to ask College Affairs to make the proposed change. The change could reduce the power of this group on campus.
- xv. It was asked if there are rules associated with how often a committee must meet. – If the committee functioned as an Ad-Hoc committee there would not be.
- xvi. It could be helpful to have Academic Affairs review this committee's minutes. This may help promote awareness on campus.
- xvii. It was mentioned that a topic for the next Learning Communities meeting may be regarding load and how information could be brought to the load taskforce that has been created.
- xviii. It would be helpful to have the Learning Communities group present a model for compensation to Academic Affairs in the near future.

5. **Syllabus Template Review – Discussion**

- a. The committee started the discussion around the syllabus template.
- b. The template was last reviewed in 2013.
- c. It was asked if committee members should bring information to add to the syllabus at the next meeting. – The answer was yes.
- d. It was conversed that Academic Affairs could start a taskforce to look at grade policy.
- e. Different categories that may be added to the template were mentioned.

6. **Requisite/Pre-Requisite Definitions**

- a. Tabled until next meeting.

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

Next Meeting: Monday, February 8th, 2016 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m.