

**Academic Standards & Practices Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
May 6, 2013  
2:30 – 4:30 pm Rm. 3.302**

**In Attendance:** Brook Maurer, Dawn Sallee-Justesen, Eric Greene, Mike Taphouse, Mary Kramer and Richard Parker, Chair

**Support Staff:** Jensi Smith

**Absent:** Gwen Johnston

**Guests:** Brian Greene, CAO, Lori Ufford, CSSO

**Facilitator – Richard Parker**

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

**1. Order 2:33 pm**

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<b>OLD Business</b>		
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>	<p><b>Minutes from 04-08-13</b> Recommended amendments for spelling, adding of motion voted on (pg. 3) <b>Approval of Minutes:</b> To approve minutes as amended</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mike <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> Mary <b>Motion: All in favor. Minutes approved</b></p>
<b>2. Continuing Education Units AR - Brook</b>	<p><b>Brook:</b> Shared that it is the same in content, just the format has been updated by Martha. Clarified what the highlight was for updating the link once the Grading Guidelines have been completed.  Lori &amp; Dawn shared how other Rogue colleges don't do the</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mary <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> Brook <b>Motion:</b> <b>All in favor. Motion approved</b></p>

<p><b>3. Withdrawl from a class – Dawn</b></p>	<p>transcripts. Brian suggested we give ourselves some room with “may establish” at the end. We could then come up with a fee if need be. Updates were noted by Brook on the document – “fees may apply. “ Motion to approve with above revisions.</p> <p><b>Dawn:</b> Dawn shared the revisions that she made. Took out week two through eight. Institutional withdrawl happens the first week of the term. Discussion regarding the terms used, updating withdraw for withdrawl.</p> <p>Motion to approve with the adjustments.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Eric <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> Mike <b>Motion:</b> All in favor. Motion approved.</p>
<p><b>4. Academic Integrity AR &amp; Academic Integrity and Hearing Procedures – Dawn &amp; Richard</b></p>	<p><b>Dawn &amp; Richard:</b> The OP had already been approved. The group reviewed the updated AR.</p> <p>Motion to approve the AR. *Question about language on the AR vs OP. Thought that the language in the title should match.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mike <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> Brook <b>Motion:</b> All in favor. Motion approved.</p>
<p><b>NEW Business—Short Announcements</b></p>		
<p><b>AGENDA ITEMS</b></p>		
<p><b>1. Election of new Committee Chair - Richard</b></p>	<p><b>Richard:</b> Richard shared that he will not be at the June meeting. He will not be on campus the rest of the academic year. He shared that it would be good to have someone take over while he is still around to help with the transition. Question about what the charter says about if the chair must be a faculty member. The</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> NA <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> <b>Motion:</b></p>

	<p>consensus was that it is faculty driven so the chair should be faculty. Suggestion that once a new faculty member joins that Richard could continue for a few months until the new person was up to speed before taking on the chair position. Discussion about where there might be available faculty members to fill in the spots. Richard is willing to mentor the new person, once they are on board.</p>	
<p><b>2. Recruitment of new full time faculty member - Richard</b></p>	<p><b>Richard:</b> Richard will send out an email to faculty after Friday’s IC meeting, where the issue of full time faculty participation in committees will be discusses.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> NA <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> <b>Motion:</b></p>
<p><b>3. Satisfactory Academic Progress – Lori Ufford</b></p>	<p><b>Lori:</b> Lori shared the updates to this. Do we only want to look at GPA or do we want to use GPA <u>and</u> credits completed? To look at all of the factors related to Academic Progress. Brian suggested that the number of credits would matter. Lori will put the addition in so it can move along. “2.0 gpa or higher and completes 50% of their credits attempted during a term” will be added. The terminology will be adjusted and sent back to Brian to review. Will not need to come back to the committee.  Motion to approve with amendments.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Brook <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> Mary <b>Motion: All in favor. Motion approved.</b></p>
<p><b>4. High School Articulation Agreements - Mary &amp; Brian</b></p>	<p><b>Mary &amp; Brian:</b> Brian presented. When he received it from Martha he talked with others about the language. He shared that if a course articulates, it articulates. Group reviewed revisions. Lori made suggestions about revisions to the language. Brian will make the updates. A sample agreement attached would be helpful. The content of this has not changed, only the formatting. Brian will make the two changes and send to Martha. Mary will make a format for the articulation</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> <b>Motion:</b></p>

	agreement.	
<b>5. Retention of student work guidelines – Eric &amp; Richard</b>	<p><b>Eric &amp; Richard:</b></p> <p>How long does student work need to be kept? The backups on Moodle are there for a fairly long time. If the course is dropped then the information would be dumped on Moodle. Eric shared that SS has one year to challenge a student’s grade. The regulations say 5 years for records retention for distance learning.</p> <p>Brian looked and found info regarding student records. He shared that student grade sheets should be kept for 10 years. (The institution would keep the transcript student record for 10 years.) The grade change can go back one year. Dawn shared that when the research had been done a while back, faculty only has to keep student work for one term beyond the term they attended. Question about the Grading Guidelines – does it address this issues. Consensus is that it does not.</p> <p>Brian shared that he thought something should be stated, it doesn’t need to be that complicated. Brian will send Eric a link so he can pull information/language from.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b></p>
<b>6. AR Status Report - Richard</b>	<p><b>Richard:</b></p> <p><b>Imbedded Instruction:</b> There was discussion about courses that we offer that have imbedded instruction. It is complicated. Mary shared that there had been discussions about not having it imbedded in a course, to have a separate course. Brian shared that there are courses that are being taught now with the imbedded instruction. Discussion about related instruction, instructor qualifications, requirements for courses within programs. Question about the amount of college credits.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Eric</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>:</b> Dawn</p> <p><b>Motion: all in favor. Motion approved.</b></p>

	<p>**Motion - the instructor qualifications document spells out specific instructor qualifications and needs to be owned by the ASPC and needs to be more closely associated to the AR, maybe needs to be part of the AR.</p> <p>Richard shared that some re-writing will need to be done. Mary had done some work before. Mary will check with Susan Lewis and get back with Brian to get the re-write done so it can be brought back for approval.</p> <p>Richard shared that there are a number of ARs that are in the final stages. Brian suggested that in the fall it might be good to re-visit the email standards.</p> <p>Richard will contact Brook to see if she will be able to facilitate next month's meeting.</p>	
<b>Adjournment</b>	<b>Adjournment at 4:10 pm</b>	

**Next meeting: TBD – June 3, 2013 in Room 3.202**