

**Academic Standards & Practices Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 6, 2012
2:30 – 4:30 pm Rm. 3.301**

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

Support Staff: Jensi Smith

Absent: Mary Kramer, Gwen Johnston

Guests: Brian Greene, CAO

Facilitator – Richard Parker

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

1. Order 2.35 pm

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
OLD Business		
1.	Minutes from 11-01-12: Amendments for Minutes: Typo on pg 4 corrected. Question about language for graduation policy. This section was only for reference. The official language will be different.	Motion: Brook – approve as amended 2nd: Dawn Motion : All in favor
NEW Business—Short Announcements		
	<u>PCC Academic Standards & Practices:</u> Richard Parker presented - A recap. Nothing new going on at PCCs ASPC. Been working on the same stuff they have been working on for a while. Same stuff we have been talking about.	
AGENDA ITEMS		

1	<p><u>Review of joint meeting with Curriculum Committee:</u></p> <p><u>Feedback:</u></p> <p>The areas on the list from the joint meeting which have been designated for the AS&PC to address are: #4(Credit Guidelines), #5 (Degree & Certificate substitution standards), #6 (Course Challenge), & #8 (Granting CEUs)</p> <p>What was taken away from the conversation was that on the issue of related instruction was that the wording of the policy would encourage standalone courses. What we (the ASPC) had in writing is basically what came back around to at the CC meeting.</p> <p>It had been previously agreed that this committee would be the end point with these procedures. Richard pointed out that many of the issues that were talked about during the meeting had not been reviewed by the Curriculum Committee(CC). The discussion was about how the process works, getting feedback from stakeholders.</p> <p>Brian shared that he felt that the work being done by the committees would be better than having everything coming from the CAO.</p> <p>There was a consensus that a standard is needed. A place to go to for guidance on how things work. The committee would work on the wording after the feedback has been received. After the policy has been written it would go to the CAO and CSSO for review.</p> <p>Richard shared that before everything was being prepped to go to the Board, but NW said that not everything would need to go to the board. So some changes in process were made.</p> <p>This committee has to be very disciplined to keep things moving,</p>	
---	--	--

making sure that is was ready to go before being put out there. A draft of a policy for soliciting feedback will need to be established. Dawn will bring some examples.

#4, #5, & # 6 are items that ASPC has been working on. These are items that this committee should get feedback from the CC.

#8 is something that would need to be developed jointly. PCC has a good, solid policy in practice that clearly state “this is what we do - this is what we don’t do.” To let this become our policy, it would take another staff person to be hired to track all of this. We can provisionally adopt what PCC has to carry forward?

Richard identified other items that have fallen into CC realm. Richard reviewed some of the list. Richard agreed to be part of the CC discussion on repeatability our courses. The embedded instruction piece – the CC has shared feedback that they would like to keep the door open on this issue.

A big thing that we need to address – subject area committee/academic departments. Ultimately the departments are the ones that have curriculum input. How does that work? This is a whole new issue. Until now, it has been an individual instructor asking Department Chairs. There needs to be a thoughtful process at the department level.

Other big one – the authority of the three committees? It will be discussed at the IC meeting on the 14th. It was noted that the three committees are like a three-legged stool, non are subservient to the

	<p>others.</p> <p>There are issues that are going to come up that other committee will be consulted about. CC would do curriculum specific items. The IC would be responsible for things like faculty qualifications.</p> <p>Figuring the roles of the three committees is important.</p>	
2	<p><u>Progress reports on assignments:</u></p> <p>Dawn: Procedure of Academic Integrity:</p> <p>Dawn and Karen reviewed Student Rights and Responsibilities. This is a huge document. They updated the language and pulled out the policies that are already written. It hasn't been moved along. The procedure probably needs to go to Martha. She has the Academic Integrity AR. Things have been cleaned up and recommendations asked for.</p> <p>Syllabus: Couldn't find the list for Must and Mays as she had recycled her FOE folder. She found the OAR (Oregon Administrative Rules) that documents course syllabus records. Brook shared that the Instructional Council a long time ago put together a checklist. Dawn said what she was looking for was more a list of Musts and Mays.</p> <p>BM –is that something that should go to the IC? It seems like something that is instructional. Richard suggested that they (the IC) should review it but it should have some structure first. The template doesn't have the must and mays. But it is a baseline to start from.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skip credit for prior learning for right now. <p>Eric: Academic Departments/ Subject Area Committees: Richard</p>	

brought this to IC. Eric is working with Richard on this one.

Nontraditional credit for prior learning:

Richard asked if this was something that CC or IC need to be involved in. Dawn shared that the instructor needs to sign off for student to use this. It has to be approved by a Department Chair. Richard asked if it should then be certain to go to IC? Dawn said there are state standards that have to be followed so there isn't too much room to change things. Richard shared that even if it is informational, it would be better to share with IC before it is turned into an AR.

Articulation for credit:

HS students can take courses that cover the same items as the college course content and receive credit for it. (One year in HS for a 1 term ?1 credit? Course).

Brook:

She looked at Central Oregon and Lane. CO's policy is that if someone develops a course on their own time, they can keep it as theirs. At Lane it cannot be sold to students, it is owned by the college. PCC is that if an employee develops something on their own time, they can sell it if they get a contract before hand for a for-profit endeavor. It doesn't speak specifically to the sale of materials to students. Dawn shared that there is a board policy about selling anything for anyone on campus. Recommended that the board policy be reviewed for reference. Brook read more from the policies she had found for reference. Lane has language that PCC and OC do not.

Richard suggested it is good to look beyond just the Oregon

	<p>Community College realm to review this. Dawn shared that there must be an OAR addressing this. Suggested to look under CCWD?</p> <p>Gwen is working with Richard on Alternative Assignment for Religious Reasons: Richard shared that we really need a policy. There are a bunch of things out there he has found nationally. There need to be a mechanism for students to make up assignments, not necessarily just give them the points or whatever, but an opportunity to make it up. It might be something that needs to go on the syllabus? Lori had previously shared that SS has something in place. Richard has gotten items from public universities, that have clear policies and procedures that can be referenced. Dawn – there is probably something is the students’ rights and responsibilities.</p> <p>Continued Education Credits: We have very few. Maybe we should just look through the language and make sure it is stated (ie - CEU request form from PCC) how we want it. Maybe this should be taken to Suzanne Burd since she is the main person in this area. Brook will ask her to take a look at it. Phlebotomy and one Other?? Want to hear their feedback before instituting a policy.</p> <p>Equal Opportunity statement was read. Robb reviews all the ARs so he will be taking a look at it.</p> <p>Brian shared that Tria had talked to him about the need for board policies to be teased out to get rid of the ones that already have an AR in place that supersedes them. Dawn will bring her matrix that she used for that process she used in SS. Richard will take a look at all of the instruction related ones to help with the process too.</p>	
7. Adjournment	Adjournment at 3:40 pm	

Next meeting: January 10, 2012