

**Academic Standards & Practices Committee -Draft
Meeting Minutes
February 4, 2013
2:30 – 4:30 pm Rm. 3.302**

In Attendance: Brook Maurer, Mary Kramer, Dawn Sallee-Justesen, Eric Greene, Gwen Johnston and Richard Parker, Chair

Support Staff: Jensi Smith

Absent: Mike Taphouse

Guests: Brian Greene, CAO

Facilitator – Richard Parker

- A. **Review Minutes**
- B. **Agenda Review**
- C. **Guest Presenters:**

1. Order 2:34 pm

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
OLD Business		
Approval of Minutes	Minutes from 01-10-13 Richard checked in with members regarding last month’s meeting minutes. Asked for questions, recommendations for revisions, etc. Dawn asked for a revision to Syllabi Guidelines language. Also, a sub category was added to Agenda Item #4 to cover the discussion not directly related to the agenda items. Motion and 2 nd . Approved.	Motion: Mary 2nd: Gwen Motion: To approve the minutes as amended. All in favor. Minutes Approved.
1. Follow Up with Curriculum Committee - Richard	Richard: Richard and Dawn will meet with members of the Curriculum Committee. They will work on the rules that need revised or updated, check in on exactly where we are with these.	
2. Administrative Rules & Operating	Richard: Martha and Tria captured the standards, but there really wasn’t a tab for	

Procedure Updates	Academic Standards or what was under Instruction, nothing to identify what needs to be reviewed by this committee, what will need to be changed, what is being held to the side for after accreditation, etc. The tracking is very difficult the way it is. The hope is to make it <u>updated</u> , <u>rescinded</u> , <u>approved</u> , etc. Brian and Dawn are going to have a meeting with Tria to try and clear up the process so these items are easier to identify. The work that needs to be done is available - the confusion is to where in the process it is. Does it need more work, is it approved, etc. Richard will work on a complete list of things he believes has been sent up to Martha.	
NEW Business—Short Announcements		
PCC Academic Standards & Practices Report- Richard	Richard:	
AGENDA ITEMS		
1. Institutional Withdrawal – Richard & Dawn	<p>Brian: There has been some confusion about this policy. He wanted to make sure that anything that has been approved is as clear as the policy that is currently posted on the website (this was shared with the group). The part that is confusing it that it suggests that the responsibility is somewhat with the faculty.</p> <p>Dawn suggested that both of the versions have the responsibility resting with the student. There was consensus that there needs to be a mechanism in place where under certain circumstances the institution can withdraw a student. Richard suggested that assessment is also affected if students do not officially withdraw, but they still are technically registered students, even if they do not attend class.</p> <p>Brook – asked for clarification as to whether or not a faculty member currently can withdraw a student from the course? It was decided that it needs to have more clarification.</p> <p>Dawn suggested that she feels that there needs to be an attendance policy. Dawn read different versions from other colleges and from our rules. It was</p>	

	<p>suggested that it be cleaned up so that it clearly states it is the student’s responsibility in the broad sense, but the faculty would have responsibility in the first week. As it is, it is very confusing. Brian suggested that we check with PCC to see how they have reconciled this issue. The difference between withdrawals vs. dropped students. Dawn will check with PCC and get back to the group.</p> <p>Brian asked if there was a priority list for standards that this group is addressing. Would this group work on brand new items or work to revise or finalize other issues? The consensus was that since this one in particular has come up, it should be addressed sooner than later. Dawn will check with student services, financial aid, the stakeholders and report back.</p>	
<p>2. Syllabus Guidelines – Mary & Dawn</p>	<p>Dawn: She found that the office hours was one place that was a bit different. Since it is a ‘may’ it might not matter.</p> <p>Also, performance based learning outcomes is listed in OARS to be considered as a ‘may’. We list ‘Intended outcomes’ for the course.</p> <p>Mary – concerned that currently most of the syllabi that we get do not contain all of these guidelines. The dual credit listing could be a problem. We might need to identify what is required or what is optional. Should be very clear, so Instructional Services could know if it meet the requirements or not.</p> <p>Richard – there may be some push back ton having it be required. If it is a standardized “form”.</p> <p>Brook – maybe a subcommittee at the IC level? Richard suggested that this group draft up something to share with the IC. Mary suggested that if all the elements are required for dual enrollment, this will need to be standardized. Gwen shared that the syllabi is the contract between the instructor and the student. Brook suggested that Dawn’s narrative could work the way that it is. Richard said that we need something to make this uniform across the college. Mary will work on drafting something up for next time.</p>	
<p>3. Academic</p>	<p>Richard: He developed a document based on something that was created by</p>	

<p>Departments/Subject Area Committees – Eric & Richard</p>	<p>PCC's SACs. Richard passed the document out to members. There was some discussion as to the when/how often the subject area committee might meet. During in-services, develop SAC meetings, etc. How much to lock it down?? There were some questions about specifics of wording, what should be included. Richard will share this with the IC at the next meeting. He will ask for feedback, but not to finalize at this point.</p> <p>Brook – why do all departments need subject area committees? Some departments only have that subject, such as Math. Richard shared that it may end up that they are one and the same.</p> <p>Richard said that this will mirror what is already going on but for his department and others like Business & Social Science department this would give them an option to separate it out.</p> <p>Brook will send Richard an email that states what is required for her non-credit classes so Richard can include it in this standard.</p> <p>Suggestions were made for rewording of some areas. Richard made notes and commented on some of the suggestions. He asked that members send him suggestions. It was noted that there are many departments where the content of the subjects being taught in that department's courses is very different from each other. Brook will send the information to Richard via email. Richard will make updates before taking to IC.</p>	
<p>4. Use and Sale of Instructor Authored Materials - Brook</p>	<p>Brook: She could not find an OAR on this. Her information was more about things happening at University level, not too relevant to our school. She found some colleges that develop contracts with instructors so they can get paid for their development.</p> <p>Some of what she found is that if instructors use college resources, they will not be paid for that material. If they develop something that is independent</p>	

	<p>of the college, not using college resources, it might be different. Brook shared a statement that she found that gave a little background. If an instructor has something published privately, these would need to still be approved (by whoever is designated to make that decision) for use in the classroom. There was a philosophy statement that stated if it was being generally used in that subject area, it could be used. It was discussed that part of the decision is whether it is commercially sold, then it would be different than if the instructor developed it for less commercial use.</p> <p>Discussion on who should be responsible to make the decision, to develop the contract, etc. Want to keep the door open for instructors to develop good stuff, without leaving it too open. There are two different issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Commercially produced and generally accepted in the subject area or 2) Material developed specifically for the college, on the college time/college dime <p>Brook will make updates and put in both scenarios, and will get the information on the course development contracts and bring it back to the group.</p>	
<p>5. Alternative Assignments – Gwen & Richard</p>	<p>Gwen: She found some policies. The ones that were long that discussed if faculty have an issue with a religious holiday. For the student ones, it stated that if a student had an issue, it was their responsibility to inform the faculty within a reasonable amount of time at the beginning of the term. It stated that every effort would be made to give the student an alternative assignment.</p> <p>Richard brought up that it might not be just religious reasons; it might be for</p>	

	<p>court, jury duty, etc. Discussion included whether to include attendance; if it was something the student knew ahead of time; if it should be part of the incomplete process, etc. This situation has actually come up recently, but as we did not have a policy in place, it ended up as an issue. Gwen will draft up a policy and bring it back.</p>	
<p>6. Continuing Education Credits - Brook</p>	<p>Brook: She found a form that needs to be filled out. She talked to Suzanne Burd, who shared that she has pretty much stopped doing CEU. Brook asked if we send our CEUs through the Curriculum Committee. Brian shared an update –the CC just decided to have it go to Susan Lewis, not the committee, so that it has been through a process, not necessarily through an approval.</p> <p>Brook will send what she has to Susan Lewis to assure that it aligns with what the Curriculum Office has established.</p>	
<p>7. Other Standards to Address</p>	<p>For next time Dawn would like a few items to be revisited. She shared them with Richard so they can be taken care of first thing at the next meeting.</p>	
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>Adjournment at 4:33 pm</p>	

Next meeting: March 4th, 2013