

**Academic Standards & Practices Committee
Draft - Meeting Minutes
May 22, 2014
2:30 – 4:30 pm Rm. 3.301**

In Attendance: Mary Kramer, Gwen Johnston, Emilie Miller, Dawn Sallee-Justesen, Eric Greene, Mike Taphouse

Support Staff: Jensi Smith

Absent:

Guests:

Facilitator – Mary Kramer (Acting Chair)

1. Order 2:34 pm

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
OLD Business	None	
Approval of Minutes	Group reviewed 3-20-14 minutes. On the last page <i>since</i> was changed to <i>sense</i> . Motion: To approve minutes as amended.	Motion: Mike 2nd: Eric Action: Minutes approved as amended.
Agenda Items		
Termination of a Program (Dawn)	Dawn: Reviewed Teach Out and Termination of Program. Teach Out has been eliminated and just going with Program Termination with a line about Teach Out. This has been reviewed with Susan Lewis. All the stakeholders are involved. The checklist was developed and if there is a call for termination, the planning doc would be filled out and taken to the CC meeting, the Chief, President and onto the Board.	Motion: Eric 2nd: Gwen Action: Termination of Program was approved as written

	<p>Dawn shared that the AR and OP are pretty strong. The documents may need further review. Once one has gone through the process, needs for change may become apparent. The Teach Out would last for year to get students in the first year a chance to complete. Then the Termination of the Program process would begin. Mary commented that she was happy to have a process in place, instead of having the termination of a program be on a whim. Dawn shared that when a program is up to be terminated, any holes would be addressed. Once it is approved here, it will go to Martha, then on to the President to be added to the AR list. There were no other questions or comments.</p> <p>Motion: Approve Termination of a Program as written</p>	
<p>Finalize Review of Schedule (Dawn)</p>	<p>Dawn: Dawn shared the schedule of review, making note that the dates needed changed because of canceled meetings. She also noted that it was <i>grade</i> grievance not just grievance. Mary asked if it was ready to be approved. Dawn shared that these were the things that had been on the agenda for April.</p> <p>Discussion of the process for approvals and reviews. Dawn recommends that a process be approved so that it can be posted, so people know what it is. There is a need for a formal place for departments to submit their requests. Mary asked if the group felt there should be a meeting in June. The consensus is that June is very busy. Some faculty will be teaching summer, some won't. Since there is a number of things that need to be addressed, the group will meet on 6-12-14 10:30 to Noon. The ones that don't get addressed today from April and May can be addressed then.</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>
<p>Alternative Assignments (Gwen & Mike)</p>	<p>Gwen & Mike: Gwen shared her draft that was given to Richard some time ago. She wasn't sure where it went. Discussion about whether it was only for religious reasons, or was it decided that it could be for other things as well? The group reviewed the document, suggestions were made about whether some of the wording could just be changed to make it</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>

	<p>broader for more than just religious needs. Dawn suggested that maybe this should be reviewed by Robb in HR.</p> <p>Mike had previously created a form to accompany this. He looked for it on the website and couldn't find it. He did find it on the shared drive.</p> <p>The consensus was that the AR should be specific with details for what it can be used for including religious and non-religious reasons – all on one document. Mike will review with Robb. Mike shared there is a place on the form for students to state what the request for alternative assignment is for.</p>	
<p>Related Instruction</p>	<p>Mary: This is the same thing that we looked at last time, but this time the form is included as well. The group reviewed the form. Mary shared that this is something that is needed for CTE courses. Susan Lewis created this form to address this. Mary shared that the form explains this. This primarily is connected to the AAS degrees. Discussion on what that looks like in certain courses. Mary asked for any more feedback. No major problems with it as written.</p> <p>Motion: Approve the Related Instruction document as written. This will be sent on to Martha Dell.</p>	<p>Motion: Gwen 2nd: Mike Action: Approve as written.</p>
<p>Satisfactory Academic Progress OP (Mike)</p>	<p>Mike: Mike shared that at some point Dawn may be responsible for initiating this. Mike shared that he, Lori and some others came up with a draft of the process. He viewed how this is set up by term. Dawn had to leave, but she had read this previously. Mary stated that we could approve this item today.</p> <p>Eric made a suggestion for some word change to 'standards'. Mike made updates on document.</p> <p>Some discussion regarding credits vs GPA. It may have been either / or. There was discussion of how that works in the RogueNet system.</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>

	<p>Not sure how to make the numbers work in Rogue. It was suggested it might be difficult to come up with a formula; it might need to be done manually. It could be flagged in the system, and then would be looked at from there. Gwen brought up how the overall GPA might become an issue. It was noted that this process would only address the students' status term by term. Mike shared that it flags when a student starts to slip, the first term it is recognized. If that doesn't get the student back on track, the student is required to speak with an advisor the second term. More discussion on how the student's % could be affected by their grades. The students that were below 2.0 would be looked at in the beginning of the process. It was decided that this would go back to Dawn/Lori to confirm the language. It will be addressed at the June meeting.</p>	
<p>Academic Departments/Subject Area Committees (Mary)</p>	<p>Mary: Mary shared that this was an issue that Richard was really interested in. Maybe it would be good to clarify the process, to make it formal. Do we want subject area committees or something that states that Department Chairs should have to speak with their department before making departmental decisions? Mary asked if anyone had comments or concerns about how things have worked to this point.</p> <p>Gwen asked about what are the advantage/disadvantages of doing this? Eric shared some of his experience in the CAOS department. Emilie spoke to how it has been in the Science department. Mary shared that her experience is that Department Chairs seem to work well within their departments.</p> <p>The consensus was that this hasn't been an issue to date, so it will not be addressed at this time.</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>
<p>Committee Charter/New Members (Mary)</p>	<p>Mary: Mary shared the most recent Charter document that was found in Richard's files. It was noted that the title of Chief Academic and Chief Student Services Officer's title needs to be changed to CASAO. Section 'E' will need to be deleted. Last update date revised on the</p>	<p>Motion: 2nd: Action:</p>

bottom of the document. Jensi will post after it has been reviewed and approved by everyone via email.

Mary noted that the announcement asking for a new member didn't happen at the spring in service. She shared that if Lori doesn't have a chance to do that soon, Mary will do it prior to the June meeting. The chair position discussion will be postponed until a new member is selected.

**Mary reviewed the list Dawn shared and noted the items that will need to be reviewed at the next meeting. How would things be noted so the process can be developed?

**The Request for a new AR. Mary will draft a form that will be posted on the ASPC website once it is approved. She will bring it to the June meeting. Mary reviewed the list of items with the group that will be working on at the June meeting.

**Emilie asked about the drop date is at the end of the first week, instead of the second week. Mary shared that she thought this was an issue that had been decided by the IC but couldn't remember why. She suggested that Emilie and she go to Instructional Services to talk to Char who might remember or have it in the IC meeting minutes. Gwen shared how it is in Nursing. Emilie shared how it worked at another Community college.

**Emilie asked about the CSSE (student engagement survey) and shared that she had heard from students a lot of negative feedback. Mike shared that the administrators of the survey provide a lot of information to Student Services as well as feedback for students. Emilie was curious as to what we gain from the survey, is the information used? Mike shared that it has been helpful in a variety of ways. Emilie shared that she would like to see it administered on line or some other way so it didn't take away from class time for

	<p>students. Question if it is an optional survey? Mike shared that it is but had been done for a number of years. This also has information that ties to retention/planning. Mary shared that she would share that feedback with Lori. Mary shared that the classes are picked ahead of time. Emilie said it would be helpful if instructors knew ahead of time, to arrange their schedules accordingly. Mike said that it is a national survey, with a small space for us to place our institutional questions.</p> <p>**Instructor qualifications - Mary will check with Lori on the status of this one - has it been approved by this group and just waiting for Lori's review.</p> <p>**Jensi will work with Danny in IT to create a space on the AS&PC web page to post pending AR/OPs for feedback from faculty. It will be posted for two weeks, feedback will be brought back to the group for discussion, then final version will be forwarded on to Martha. When items are posted Jensi will send an email to all faculty with the link to the page, notifying them the item is ready for review. The feedback will come to Jensi. Jensi will forward to the acting Chair until a committee chair is selected, then it will be routed to the Chair.</p>	
Adjournment	Adjournment at 3:50 pm	

Next meeting: October 23, 2014