

community college

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes Date: 10/31/2016, Monday 3:30-4:30 PM Location: Max Merrill Room, Library 221

Present (voting members):

Eddie Johnson (Faculty Forum President) Stephanie Andrè (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)

Absent (non-voting members):

Courtney Whetstine (Director of Admissions & Registrar) Jeff Floyd (IT Representative)

Guests:

Layla Solar (Admissions and Records)

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

1. <u>Review Minutes from 10/17/16 Meeting</u>

- a. The meeting was open to review the minutes from the last meeting.
- b. Update from Tim: He went to College Affairs and they approved CTE council representative (Brian Bubak).
- c. They also approved the change in title to the "Note taker" position. It will now be the committee specialist.
- d. Will Colette be added to the committee matrix?
- e. Tim will follow up with Terri Botts regarding the new matrix.



f. Dana Topliff motioned to approve the minutes from 10/17/16, Stephanie Andrè seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. <u>Discussion Only: Review of Curriculum Committee Minutes from 10/4/16; 10/18/16;</u> 10/25/16.

- a. The meeting was open to review all of the minutes from the October 2016 Curriculum meetings.
- b. Question about 10/25 minutes 2, iii, 2.
 - i. It was clarified that anything regarding policy/procedure will go to Academic Affairs for approval. Other items will be approved in the committee.
 - ii. Question: the notes in this section indicate "with the current VPI and Academic Affairs membership, they are supportive of Curriculum committee approving rather than recommending to approve." will this come up for discussion again if leadership changes?
 - 1. Yes, it may come up again under new membership/leadership. Once language in the charge has been changed, this may help.

3. Ad Hoc Discussion:

a. Brian Bubak was introduced to the group. He will act as a liaison between CTE council and Academic Affairs regarding information in AA.

4. SECOND READING: Academic Reinstatement Committee

- a. The revised proposal was reviewed by the committee.
- b. There was no feedback received from the college campus to report.
- c. Question: Does Courtney have a mechanism in place for the new two-year Faculty Forum appointments?
- d. There used to be two people in the transfer position and possibly two in the CTE. The current proposal only has one of each. Should this be two positions? Two positions may be helpful.
- e. Layla will take this feedback to Courtney for review.
- f. Betsy Julian motioned to approve the proposal with no change. There was no movement to second the motion. The proposal will be tabled until the question presented can be reviewed with Courtney.

5. Discussion Only: Grading Policy

- a. Eddie gave an overview to the group on the status of a grading policy proposal. The following information was shared:
 - i. The subject was recognized last year when the Academic Affairs committee was reviewing the syllabus template policy. The template states that faculty can decide on any grading scale as they determine. There is not a set scale across campus. Eddie is looking for input from all faculty. The topic was presented at ChairMoot last week. The Chairs will survey faculty in their department to determine what grading scales are being used. This information will be helpful to a proposal. During the discussion at ChairMoot, the validity of a D grade was brought up. This issue is separate from the grading policy, but is related.
- b. The group discussed some of the big challenges that will need to be addressed while reviewing the proposal. The below topics were conversed:



- i. Some programs may need scales set. EMS and HIT are examples where the grading scale is set to accreditation standards.
 - 1. Comment there is not a concern with programs doing this for accreditation standards, but concern that other departments could adopt a scale that may not be appropriate for a program.
 - 2. The group also discussed prerequisites in the EMS program, and what happens when students do not pass. There were also comments about students using blue forms for approval, and what this means for registration (instructor approval on a blue form overrides all registration requirements).
- ii. Perhaps there may not be as much concern with the topic as it initially seems. This will become more transparent as a proposal is reviewed.
- iii. It's possible instructors will start defaulting to the grading scale example in the new syllabus template.
- iv. Even if there is consistency, there are issues within the topic that may need further review (i.e. A+ grades).
- v. If a C- grade is added, will this be considered a passing grade?
- vi. The impact on student scholarships will be something to consider.
- vii. The language in the college catalog will be something to address. Over time, there have been changes to how this is listed, and it has significant impacts on certificates and degrees.
- viii. Keep in mind how this will impact the catalog production.
- c. Eddie will wait for ChairMoot/CTE council to present more data before a proposal is submitted to Academic Affairs.

Eddie Johnson motioned to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Next Meeting: Monday, November 14, 2016 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m.