

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes

Date: 2/22/2016, 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):

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

Absent (non-voting members):

All Present

Guests

Amy Howell (*Early Childhood Education*)

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

1. **Review minutes from 2/8/16**

- a. The meeting was open for discussion on the draft minutes from 2-8-16.
- b. **Paula Simone motioned to approve the minutes from 2/8/16 with no changes. David Liu seconded the motion. The voting members unanimously approved the minutes with no changes.**

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

- a. It was asked if the new program deactivation process is going smoothly. – It was discussed that it is working well.
- b. There was discussion about the changes occurring within business degrees and certificates.
- c. It was mentioned that the language on the form being used for curriculum changes does not match the language used in the college catalog.
- d. It was asked if there has been more conversation on the extent of review for courses that have recently been reviewed by the Curriculum committee. There has been additional discussion. This is something the committee is working through. It was mentioned that the Curriculum committee is committed to reviewing and improving student learning outcomes. The concern

for items that have recently gone through Curriculum committee is that a new group of people may see learning outcomes slightly differently.

- e. Could outcomes be vetted then state that they cannot be reevaluated for 3-5 years? – This is being discussed as an option.
- f. New software would help to see when outcomes have been changed. This would aid in the review process for items that go through Curriculum
- g. There was additional discussion about what happens when program outcomes get changed at the state level.

3. **FIRST READING: ECE-DALE CTE Program**

- a. The group was asked for feedback regarding the Early Childhood Education DALE proposal.
- b. The following questions and topics were discussed:
 - i. Does Head Start require they have the certificate? – No but the credits count towards what Head Start requires.
 - ii. One course is pending approval (ED 176).
 - iii. All courses for this certificate are part of the AAS degree.
 - iv. The potential enrollment chart was reviewed.
 - v. For students pursuing an AAS degree, the DALE certificate would automatically be awarded once they complete the requirements.
 - vi. How much overlap is there with the Child Family and Community Studies certificate and the DALE certificate? – 3 classes
 - vii. The state has a faster track for approving certificates that take less than 1 year to complete. This proposal would fall into that category.
 - viii. Are there other schools students may be able to transfer course work to and satisfy program requirements? – Potentially the University of Oregon.
- c. **Dana Topliff motioned to approve the proposal for first reading. Paula Simone seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the proposal for first reading.**

4. **SECOND READING: Pre-Requisite & Requisite Definitions**

- a. There were no additional questions or comments presented to the committee from the college community.
- b. It was mentioned that Admissions and Records is going to submit a proposal to develop a pre-requisite error auto drop policy. This is currently a manual process.
 - i. It was discussed that instructors can sometimes override students without realizing a student does not have a prerequisite.
 - ii. Are there issues for students currently in a prerequisite registering for a class the following term with the prerequisite requirement? – No, as long as they are registered in the class.
 - iii. With the proposal, does it only flag a student if they fail or drop? What if they have an incomplete? – There is an existing process regarding students with incompletes. It will be reviewed how this affects the policy.
 - iv. This should not impact the current proposal to add a definition to a “Prerequisite with Concurrency”.
 - v. It was discussed that a student receiving a “D” in a prerequisite class will not be able to register for a class requiring the prerequisite. The student must receive a “C” or higher.
 - vi. There was additional discussion around prerequisite language in the catalog, programming prerequisites in banner, and how prerequisites are included in course descriptions.



- c. Will these be posted anywhere else besides the curriculum website? – The 2016-17 college catalog.
- d. Is it possible this would be anywhere else that should be updated?
- e. Perhaps when put on the curriculum website a time stamp should be added.
- f. Is the proposal to just add “Prerequisite with Concurrency” to the college catalog, or also language for the other definitions? - It is just for prerequisite with concurrency.
- g. There was discussion about having the language for the college catalog less technical than the official definition for the college.
- h. **David Liu motioned to approve the proposal for second reading. Jenni Newby seconded the motion. The proposal was unanimously approved for second reading.**

5. **Syllabus Template Review-Discussion**

- a. The items previously discussed to add to the syllabus were reviewed.
 - i. Incomplete Policy
 - ii. Withdrawal Policy
 - iii. Deadlines
- b. The additional items were discussed regarding the Syllabus Template:
 - i. It would be helpful to have someone look at this from the online course perspective as there may need to be wording changes if this will be for an online course.
 - ii. It may be helpful to add a section regarding what students can expect for response times from instructors.
 - iii. The idea was mentioned to indicate if a course is using blackboard.
 - iv. For learning outcomes, COCC has been working towards using the word “do” instead of “know”. It would be good to remove the word “know” under learning outcomes and just include the word “do”.
 - v. There was discussion about including outcomes on the syllabus and other schools practices for publishing outcomes.
- c. The committee began discussions on what will be required on the syllabus and what may be optional. The following sections were discussed:
 - i. Course Information Section – *Required*
 - 1. Will work on adding information to incorporate online classes.
 - ii. Instructor Section – *Required*
 - 1. It was proposed to require instructor name, office hours, and contact information. Contact information will be at the discretion of the instructor.
 - iii. Course Description – *Required*
 - iv. Pre-requisite/Program – This will be removed
 - 1. The Pre-requisite will be contained in the course description.
 - v. Learning Outcomes – *Required*
 - vi. Instructional Methods – *Optional*
 - 1. It was asked how detailed this section needs to be.
 - 2. There was discussion about courses that may go in a different direction for the term.
 - 3. It was discussed that this may be a place to include information regarding Blackboard use.

Eddie Johnson motioned to adjourn the meeting. Jenni Newby seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:32pm.

Next Meeting: Monday, March 7, 2016 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m.