

**Academic Standards & Practices Committee
 Draft - Meeting Minutes
 December 12, 2013
 2:30 – 4:30 pm Rm. 3.301**

In Attendance: Mary Kramer, Mike Taphouse, Gwen Johnston, Emilie Miller, Richard Parker, Chair

Support Staff: Jensi Smith

Absent: Dawn Sallee-Justesen, Eric Greene

Guests: Lori Ufford, CASAO

Facilitator – Richard Parker

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

1. **Order 2:38 pm**

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
OLD Business		
Approval of Minutes	Richard: Asked group to review minutes. Motion: Approve the minutes as written.	Motion: Mike 2nd: Gwen Action: All in favor; minutes approved.
1. Oregon Credit for Prior Learning Standards: Richard	Richard: Richard asked the group to review to see what Dawn was able to fill in on the different standards. <u>Standard 1:</u>	Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:

	<p>Mary noted typos in bullet two. Lori shared that she felt that bullet three – “enforces” might be better with “encourage”. Mary noted on her copy of draft. Question on bullet two. Consensus that re-evaluate was a good way of expressing.</p> <p><u>Standard 2:</u> Comments section: need to determine what assessment tool to use . Lori commented that with the work that is already happening, we will need to make note of the fact that additional staff will be needed to do this work.</p> <p><u>Standard 3:</u> Who has the authority to change the fees if needed? Lori commented that the department has that authority. She also noted that with this process that would be very different. We could define by what kind of credit the student was transferring in. Is there something that we can incorporate that we are already using? Lori shared that we don’t really know because we haven’t done a lot of this kind of work in the past.</p> <p><u>Standard 4:</u> Lori suggested minor revisions to formatting. Mary made note on her draft copy. Question about #2. Does it make sense? Discussion on what it is stating. Suggested the two could be combined. Mary made notes.</p> <p><u>Standard 5:</u> Lori suggested there was a chunk missing on this one. We would have to break these out in the six areas. It will require additional programming to break it out in those six areas.</p> <p><u>Standard 6:</u> Second to last sentence was discussed. Mary noted suggested wording on draft. Richard shared that there are no term limits</p>	
--	---	--

currently for people who are department chairs. Mary made an adjustment on the draft regarding the FTE. Mary will work with Dawn to update these changes.

Standard 7:

We said that we would need a special 'team ' to do this, but it seems we (the committee) are already doing it in that way. As an institution whenever we do a review of how a department is accepting credits for prior learning, it seems that to do it every year is a good checks and balances. We need to be consistent. Lori is concerned about Credit shopping, we would need everyone doing the same thing. Lori is not so hot about not having that much oversight. Gwen asked if we are the special 'team'? Lori suggested that it is this committee.

Richard shared the concern about this falling to the ASPC. How would it be reviewed by the IC? Mary shared that we need to set the expectations. We would just need to be sure that the departments are following it. Lori shared that the discussion about the review of the process needs to be shared with the department chairs. We are all struggling with who oversees what. We just need to be sure there will be a review of the process. Mary made notes of these suggestions on the draft to share with Dawn later.

It was noted that NTC stands for Nontraditional credit.

Under the section- if there was a financial barriers- Mary noted some of the previous comments regarding the needs. Mary noted that it will be adopted next spring. If it would go into effect the following year, would there be a need to address it when putting the budget together for next year? Lori shared that she wasn't sure that students would be aware, so she wasn't sure what the needs will be. There was a discussion about which departments would be more likely to have need for this. It may be something that needs addressed for the 15-16 budget year. Implementation would be 14-

	<p>15, going into effect 15-16. We might need to address it budget wise for 16-17.</p> <p>Richard shared that with transparency, would the word get out? Lori shared that it has to transfer into a program that we already have and it will affect all colleges, so what would the needs be for here? The nursing department might be large, and would relate a lot back to the military. Might need additional dollars available for faculty to do some of the work in 14-15 for the CPL planning. There would be someone from student services that would help a student to develop a portfolio to present to the faculty for their review.</p> <p>Richard asked if there were enough things noted for this to be passed on to Dawn for her to finish it up? Consensus yes</p>	
<p>2. Grading Guidelines: Dawn, Lori Ufford, Richard Parker</p>	<p>Dawn/Lori/Richard: Lori found the survey sent out in 2010. Two questions –d o you agree with it and what department are you from. Approximately 50 people responded. The majority said they were supportive of it. In the comments, there were a lot of questions; what were the implication of how things would be affected.</p> <p>Lori suggested that maybe at the spring in-service another survey with 5 questions might be beneficial. To get agreement on what the numbers would be to apply the +/- grades to. Her proposal is to do more studying of this and not implement it next year, but make a recommendation for 2015-16. Richard has looked for studies but not many available. He did find that there are some consistencies in the few he found. Lori said we should talk to other colleges that use this to see what the advantages of using it would be. Lori shared that there were comments on the first survey that there wouldn't be value unless all of the colleges in the state are using it too.. Lori shared that education in Oregon it looks like a proficiency based educational system seem to be headed that way. Mary suggested that she wasn't sure it would fly because of folks wanting local</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>

	<p>control. Lori feels like that is the direction that things are headed. Richard said we need to do more investigation. Lori said she was curious how many of the OSU system are using it? UO does. Others, not sure. PSU does. Richard shared that in the studies he saw, students were generally opposed. He also found that the schools who had done it for a long time, it had had very little impact. A lot of looking will need to be done on this. Lots of work for the group this year.</p> <p>Lori shared from the instructional side, the word needs to get out, having those conversations so it doesn't feel like a foreign concept. The studies that have conflicting opinions need to be shared with faculty so they can make an informed decision. We need to do a focus group with students. Lori shared we had done some of that in the past, but wasn't able to find the results of it. Lori suggested we find an avenue to get the information from students.</p> <p>There was a question about online school having this grading system. It should be looked at also. Richard shared that grades have gone up over the last few years. We are now in a consumer higher ed market. Instructors have to, in the back of their mind, look at the B+ student, and might look for a way to give the student the A. It was also noted that there is a big difference between a B+ and a B- student. There are lots of opinions on this. We need to find out "who is our student". Where are they?</p>	
3. AR Updates: Richard	Richard: Richard shared that the AR/OP web page is being revised. He wasn't sure if there is anything new. It is now in the open drop down format.	Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:
Agenda Items		
1. Winter Term Meeting Days/Times: Richard	Richard: Winter term needs – Are teaching schedules different? Gwen shared that hers are different for her clinical days. Mike is in Hood River on Tuesdays. Mary is in HR on Thursdays. Eric teaches primarily online,	Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:

	<p>so he is usually open to the day. Thursdays are good for Gwen. In February clinicals are Wednesdays and Thursdays. Richard suggested that it would be at the same time 2:30-4:30. Gwen could do that after the clinicals. Would the third Thursday of each month work for Winter term? Consensus was that it would work.</p>	
<p>2. Preliminary Schedule for Finished AR Reviews: Richard</p>	<p>Richard: Richard shared about how the rotation schedule would be on the ARs that have already been worked on. Previously it was discussed that review would happen on a three year basis, does the group want to move that to a four year rotation. Richard shared that there are instances where the AR didn't do what the group thought it would do. Gwen asked about what do other places do? How long are the ones that are up and running, how that rotation would do? The rotation would be a four year cycle, but not where everything is addressed in the fourth year. There are currently 17 that are up. These were all approved and posted last year, even if some of the work had been done previously. Some of them were virtually identical as the ones we were using while with PCC.</p> <p>There was a question of how old are the oldest items that have been worked on? Richard responded that the group has been working for six years. A couple of them were figured out by the end of the first year. Some would not have been reviewed in the last five years. Those might be put in for review next year. Having about five over a four year cycle or four on a five year rotation. Lori suggested that a five year rotation would give it space to see if it was working and not be crushed to get it done.</p> <p>Richard would like to present a list to the committee next month as a proposal of what could be done. Gwen asked that a date accompany the list. There will be a date on the official documents of when it was approved and posted, but not when it was finalized by the committee. We do have those dates in the ASPC notes.</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>

<p>3. New Committee Chair:</p>	<p>Richard: Richard shared that there needs to be a new chair so they can work with him before he leave the committee. It is recommended that the chair be a faculty member. Richard shared that it would be wise to have it be a faculty member as an administrative person would be very burden with it. Lori shared that she felt it really should be a faculty member. Richard shared that this duty shouldn't be nearly as cumbersome going forward, as much of the hard work has been done.</p> <p>Richard asked that the three sitting faculty members be thinking about becoming chair. The first charter stated that people rotated off every three years. Lori suggested that reviewing the charter should be on the list of items to be reviewed. Richard shared it had just been reviewed with the having a student and changing Lori's title. The faculty representation on the committee is two part time, two full time instructors.</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>Adjournment at 3:55 pm</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>

Next meeting: January 23, 2014