

**Academic Standards & Practices Committee
Draft - Meeting Minutes
June 12, 2014
10:30 am – Noon 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 10:34 am

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
OLD Business	None	
Approval of Minutes	Motion:	Motion: 2nd: Action:
Agenda Items		
Faculty Member to join the committee	Discussion: Group reviewed the two faculty members that have expressed interest in joining the committee. Comments regarding what the criteria should be, advantage of having someone that has been here for a long time, someone who might have experience from somewhere else, fresh eyes vs tenure. Dawn shared how the approval process (timing of) when it rolls out for the catalog. To be	Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:

	<p>mindful that anything that is approved in 14-15 won't be in effect until 15-16 and that the next year will be mostly review instead of approving a totally new procedure. Discussion about what constitutes conflict of interest. Mary asked that the group share any concerns or specific good/bad about each candidate to be shared. No one had anything specific so candidates are equal in support. Discussion on approving membership for both candidates and would it be necessary to update the charter to add an additional faculty member. The consensus was that to change the charter at this point might cause more issue down the road.</p> <p>It was decided that since both candidates were equal, the position would be filled by the flip of a coin. Tess Fegel won the coin toss. Mary shared that she would check in with Kevin to see if he is interested in joining another committee. The chair position is still in limbo, as it might be too much for a new person to come on the committee and take over as chair. Mary asked that current members think about that over the summer. Gwen asked about the possibility of co-chairs. She is very busy in the fall but after that, she might be more available. Dawn suggested there could be a chair, chair elect – who takes over when the chair is not available and who can prepare for the next year when they take over as chair.</p>	
<p>Alternative Assignments (Gwen & Mike)</p>	<p>Gwen & Mike: Gwen shared a draft document. She highlighted new things that were added to the document and reviewed with the group. Mike has not heard by from Robb (HR) on the accompanying form. Dawn shared that she is concerned about an emergent situation language. She shared that there is a criteria for students who have 'emergency'. The discussion about where to just use medical because there are other situations, such as death, etc. Dawn shared that there are other processes for some of those situations. Mary suggested that we have taken this to a broader context than what the original intent was. Maybe it should just be revised to say 'cultural'? Dawn said we should wait to hear back from Robb about</p>	<p>Motion: Mike 2nd: Eric Action: All in favor</p>

	<p>the language. Gwen said what about a death in the family? Mary asked if that is more of a makeup than giving a different assignment. Mike shared that it just needs to be broadened beyond religion. The consensus was to remove emergent and add cultural and take that draft to Robb for approval. If he is ok, the group could approve and it would go to Martha for formatting, then back to the Chief (Lori) for final approval or recommendations for revisions. Gwen will send the updated draft to Mary who will forward on to Robb and let him worry about the terminology.</p> <p>Motion: To remove emergent language, add cultural with its definition and get Robb's approval to finalize this AR.</p>	
<p>Satisfactory Academic Progress OP</p>	<p>Mike: Mike shared that there were parts of this AR that were connected to financial aid. Dawn said that financial aid has a tool to identify students who aren't making satisfactory progress. She shared details of how it works for students, how the overall GPA is affected. The AR is a term by term thing. Mike talked about how Rogue has reports but can't see student names with it. It currently has to be done manually. The goal will be to institute the academic SAP for fall term. Mike noted that once a student reaches probation, they cannot register until they have met with their advisor. Dawn shared that they are going to run the academic SAP this summer to see how it will work. Gwen asked if there are a lot of student under a 2.0 GPA. Mike and Dawn shared that there aren't too many. Some discussion about making some word changes that were noted in the minutes from last time. Mike will make any necessary changes. The draft document was reviewed. Eric asked about the reinstatement issue being noted in the AR because it is references in the OP. Dawn said it could be noted in the AR to see OP for this. The AR has already been approved, the group needs to approved the OP. There will be an edit to the AR, as it has already been through the approval process, so it would need to be re-approved by the group. Dawn said that Martha will format and do the cross referencing between the AR and OP.</p>	<p>Motion: Gwen 2nd: Mike Action: All in favor</p>

	<p>Motion: To approve the OP draft as is. Also to approve the edit to the AR to include the reference to the academic suspension reinstatement petition process.</p>	
Instructor Qualifications	<p>Mary: This is instructor approval which includes instructor qualifications. This was done last summer by Brian Greene. The group reviewed the draft document. Dawn commented about a format change to may be but not limited to with bullet points instead of or, or, or</p> <p>Eric noted the locked cabinet language. Might be better to have other language there. OP needs title change to CASAO, all those references. Mary noted that the IC had decided to change the 30 credit hours to 24. Discussion about quarter verses semester hours. Mary noted there is a conversion mechanism for this. Emilie noted she would like to see three letters of recommendation. Mary made note of these on the document.</p> <p>Motion: To call the OP Instructor Qualifications/Approval with noted amendments.</p>	<p>Motion: Dawn 2nd: Gwen Action: All in favor</p>
Experimental Courses	<p>Mary: Mary shared this draft AR with the group. This was also done by Brian Greene last summer. Eric asked about the language about future review of policies. Dawn noted that Richard had wanted that language included so it would identify this committee's role for the ARs that are this group's purview. Dawn shared the history of how this came about. This was there to note that it was an ASPC committee's role to approve. Maybe something needs to be noted under the Authority section at the top of the document? Gwen suggested it be noted under last revised portion and who revises it. Dawn shared that she is working with Martha and Tria. She will ask about this.</p> <p>Mike noted that the Chief's title should be updated. Dawn asked</p>	<p>Motion: 2nd: Action:</p>

	<p>about the limit of 9 credits. It is a requirement from the OARS. Does this need to be referenced? Dawn shared that it would need to be noted. Mary will find out about how this needs to be addressed. This one will need to come back next fall. Dawn shared that the Registrar's office would need to be notified. These are only for a limited time so the Registrar needs to be in the loop.</p> <p>Motion: N/A</p>	
<p>Course Repeatability</p>	<p>Dawn/Mary: Dawn shared the two things: Course repeatability verses and a Repeat possibility. Dawn shared the standards for each of these. Grade improvement, number of times for AAOT, etc. PCC had changed the standard where students couldn't take a course more than once for credit, with a few exceptions. It was also changed so that a course would have the a, b, c . . . Dawn explained how that affects students who might be going to an art or theatre course. This would also be a shared discussion with the Curriculum Committee. The plan is to have faculty weigh in on this issue. This is definitely an issue that needs to be addressed. There are situations with students right now where this repeatability is an issue. Gwen asked how many times a student can take a course. Dawn shared how that is related to financial aid. If you aren't on financial aid, students can take it as many times as they want, but only so many will count on their transcript for their degree. Dawn suggested that the group review what is on the books right now, to see if it is what will work best. The first C rolls into their GPA but a higher grade would be considered for entry to a program (by reviewing the transcript). The first C or better is listed on the transcript, others are noted with the repeat – R with a reference to what that means. It doesn't calculate into their GPA. The limitation may be a good idea. Would the audit be included in the three times? This will need to be revisited next year.</p> <p>Motion: N/A</p>	<p>Motion: 2nd: Action:</p>

AR Process & Submissions	<p>Mary: Mary shared this had come up at the last meeting. The group reviewed the draft that Mary worked on. Dawn asked if the language came from our college's standard. Mary said she did not get it there. Eric noted a change to the language if the draft policies are only going to be posted on the website. Discussion about the amount of time that the drafts are posted. The consensus was to leave it at two weeks. Jensi reviewed how that will look for the website.</p> <p>Dawn shared that we need to be mindful about how it is written so that it identifies that this review is only for those items that are for ASPC. There were recommendations for changes to language that Mary noted on the document. Dawn noted that it does not go to the Board, adding that it goes to the CASAO, then on to the president. Mary will clean up the information. Mary and Dawn will check to see if this needs to be approved through everyone else, or just posted on this committee's website.</p> <p>Motion: N/A</p>	<p>Motion: 2nd: Action:</p>
Revision to Charter	<p>Mary: Mary shared the revised charter with the group.</p>	
Draft Policy Web Pages	<p>Jensi: NA – access denied on the website, so draft page could not be reviewed.</p>	<p>Motion: 2nd: Action:</p>
Adjournment	Adjournment at 12:15 pm	

Next meeting: October 23, 2014