

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes

Date: 4/3/2017, 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*)
Dana Topliff (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)
Colette Hansen (*Classified Representative*)
Jessica Russell (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)

Absent (voting members):

Truman Merrifield (*Student representative*)
Brian Bubak (*Elected by Faculty Forum*)

Present (non-voting members):

Eric Weller (*Note taker*)
Vickery Viles (*Director of Curriculum & Assessment*)
Ralph Phillips (*ChairMoot Chair Elect*)
Courtney Whetstone (*Director of Admissions & Registrar*)
Jeff Floyd (*IT Representative*)
Deborah Malone (*CTE Representative*)

Absent (non-voting members):

All present

Guests:

none

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

1. Discussion-Ad Hoc

- a. Deborah Malone was announced as the new CTE Council representative filling the vacancy to Brian Bubak's no-voting position (Brian is now a voting member).
- b. The committee was also informed that Truman will be unable to attend spring meetings due to his class schedule.
- c. **Tim will check in with Truman to see if another student can fill in during his absence.**

2. Review Minutes from 2/20/17 Meeting

- a. The meeting was open to review the minutes from February 20th, 2017.

- b. **Colette Hansen motioned to approve 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 2/21/17; 2/28/17; 3/7/17; 3/14/17.**

 - a. Discussion from February 21st minutes:

 - i. There was a question from the Feb 21st minutes about the Aviation/Technology and Management and a potential title change that could impact Articulation Agreements.

 1. It was discussed this note from the minutes will not have an impact on the Articulation Agreements.
 - b. Discussion from March 7th minutes:

 - i. Old Business/Second Readings Section 1, a, I, 1 was reviewed. Under this section it noted there was not support of the removal of the health requirement from the Computer & Info Systems AAS degree. This lead to a broader discussion where the following topics where reviewed:

 1. A key issue is the lack of collaboration between departments when program changes are taking place.
 2. The history behind degree requirements was given to the group.

 - a. In 2010, Academic Affairs approved related instruction and made it up to programs to determine if HHP and other skills should be required in their AAS degrees.
 - b. CTE programs are slowly making changes to their AAS degrees as they go through Curriculum based on the past decision.
 - c. CTE program faculty surveyed at the time said they valued health classes, but felt their programs should be more focused on program specific courses.
 3. The Curriculum committee felt it was not in the scope of committee duties to make decisions on program requirements. The committee felt that if COCC needs to look at the standard, this will be something for Academic Affairs to review.

 - a. It was mentioned that if Academic Affairs determines to examine the decision from 2010, it will be important to review past discussions on the topic.
 4. A student survey from the HHP department was referenced during the Curriculum committee meeting where students were asked: "After taking this HHP class, do you think a HHP class is a worthwhile requirement for all COCC degree seeking students?". 94% of the students responded to the survey and 100% of students who responded answered yes.

 - a. Note: students polled were from different degree seeking backgrounds, but were also students already registered in HHP classes.
 5. Will the new CourseLeaf system have something to allow better collaboration for programs making changes in curriculum?

 - a. Yes, department chairs will be sent emails indicating the items going through curriculum. It will still be up to the chairs to read

these emails to determine potential impact to their departments.

4. Update: Grading Policy Taskforce

- a. The taskforce group members were reviewed. The following individuals are on the Grading Policy taskforce:
 - i. Eddie Johnson
 - ii. Rebecca Walker-Sands
 - iii. Courtney Whetstone
 - iv. Ken Swartwout
 - v. Dana Topliff
- b. The taskforce has met two times with another meeting scheduled next week.
- c. The taskforce has three topics for review:
 - i. The standardization of a grading scale.
 - ii. The possibility of a C- or A+ grade.
 - iii. Language around the incomplete grade.
- d. The taskforce has discussed some groups they would like to gather feedback from. The following groups were noted: ChairMoot, CTE Council, Faculty Forum, Student Affairs, and Student Government.
 - i. Specific options and thoughts to consider will be provided to the groups that will be polled by the taskforce.
- e. It was asked if the taskforce was given a forth charge to look at the wording of procedures vs. policy as the GP manual currently has everything combined in one section.
 - i. This was discussed that this will be something the taskforce continues to review moving forward.

5. FIRST READING: Graduation Policy

- a. The purpose of this proposal is to provide clarifying language for students.
- b. The graduation policy handout was reviewed, and the following items mentioned:
 - i. The title of the policy was renamed "Graduation Requirements".
 - ii. It was discussed that COCC may establish different layers to graduation requirements (i.e. include a section for general requirements for all certificates/degrees, and specific requirements needed for different programs).
 - iii. Clear language was defined around catalog year.
 - iv. The deviation from the standard policy was incorporated for Nursing and Paramedicine.
 1. There was additional discussion on this topic. The following items were reviewed:
 - a. In practice Admissions and Records has always bumped students back to the catalog year that the Selection Process Handbook is made available for the year they are applying (one year prior).
 - i. The purpose for this is to prevent students from getting caught in curricular changes the following year.
 - b. Faculty typically teach by the academic year the students have applied for.



- c. At times different accrediting bodies will mandate changes that must be met by students.
 - d. These situations have typically been managed through student advising.
 2. Courtney will have more detailed discussions with the program directors, Beth Wright, Seana Barry, and Layla Solar to provide more clarification to this process.
- v. Wording will be adjusted to clarify the student's default catalog year.
 1. The example discussed was if a student applies in the spring to begin classes in the fall, their default catalog year will be that of fall term, not spring.
- vi. Term of graduation was outlined and clarified.
 1. This includes information on students using transfer credits to graduate.
 2. If a student receives an incomplete grade, their graduation year will be the term in which the grade is received (i.e. a student with an incomplete grade in spring that receives a change of grade in fall will have a graduation year of that fall term).
- vii. Credits and residency language was updated.
 1. How was the number of credits determined?
 - a. It was uncertain when this was determined as it was determined previously by COCC. However, it was mentioned that about one quarters worth of credits is standard for schools.
 - b. What about certificates that are less than 18 credits?
 - c. Should there be a note for students to be aware of 4-year schools having a cap on the number of transfer credits students can get credit for?
 - i. It was discussed that this is more of an advising note, and that there may be other places this note is more suitable for.
 - d. Do College Now classes qualify as residency credits?
 - i. Yes
 - e. A note will be added to this section to help clarify credit for prior learning limitations.
- viii. Can other schools deny the acceptance of specific classes offered by COCC or other schools?
 1. It was discussed that every institution can determine what will be accepted. However, schools must adhere to certain accreditation guidelines, and also state legislation that may not make it conducive for rejecting transfer credits.
- ix. It was mentioned that the wording to number 2 under Graduation requirements may be changed to indicate "certificate and degree" requirements instead of "course" requirements.
- x. It was recommended that more research be done on how Gradtracks is currently calculating grade-point average for students as number 4 under graduation requirements states: Earn a minimum 2.0 cumulative grade-point average in COCC degree/certificate applicable courses.
 1. Academic Affairs will need to decide if this requirement should stay written as it is or if it should be changed.



xi. Additional conversation began around catalog year and requirements, but will start up again next meeting.

c. Betsy Julian motioned to table the proposal until the next Academic Affairs meeting. Jessica Russell seconded the motion. The committee unanimously agreed to table the proposal.

6. FIRST READING: Title IX Syllabus Statement

a. There was not sufficient time to discuss this item at the meeting. As a result, it was tabled until April 17th.

Eddie Johnson motioned to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 4:34pm.

Next Meeting: Monday, April 17, 2017 – Max Merrill, Library 221 at 3:30 p.m.