

**Academic Standards & Practices Committee
Meeting Minutes
November 21, 2013
2:30 – 4:30 pm Rm. 3.301**

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

Support Staff: Jensi Smith

Absent:

Guests: Kevin McCabe, Lori Ufford

Facilitator – Richard Parker

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

1. Order 2:35 pm

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>Short Announcements - Richard</p>	<p>Committee Charter Revision : Richard shared an updated copy of the Charter with revisions to <u>student membership</u> and <u>to Lori's title</u>. Gwen asked about the reason for removing the student component and asked if it would be better to state that a student could join if interested. Richard shared that previously there had been a lot of time and effort in finding a student and thought it best to leave it out so the charter didn't need to be revised again for this.</p>	<p>Motion: Eric 2nd: Mike Action: Changes to the charter accepted as revised.</p>

OLD Business		
<p>1. Approval of Minutes</p>	<p>Minutes from 10-16-13</p> <p>Approval of Minutes: Motion: To accept minutes as written</p>	<p>Motion: Eric 2nd: Mary Action: All in favor; Minutes approved</p>
<p>2. Related Instructions: Mary</p>	<p>Mary: Mary shared that the document that was shared was a revised/minimal copy of what PCC had used. We have highly encourages courses to be stand alone with the related instruction as an option. The previous one was more of what the group had originally drafted but Susan Lewis had suggested that more of the detail be added back. This is the end result.</p> <p>This would in essence be the AR. This can be sent to Martha with a note that it comes from the ASPC. She will format. It will go back to Lori for comments. It will be finalized at that point. Motion to accept draft that was presented.</p>	<p>Motion: Gwen 2nd: Mike Action: Draft document approved for Related Instruction.</p>
<p>3. Grading Guidelines: Dawn & Lori</p>	<p>Dawn/Lori: Dawn shared that she had spoken with Lori on this. This needs to be ready to propose by Spring Faculty In-service.</p> <p>November / December – Inquiry –research what other schools are doing. Dawn’s research had only found one community college that used the +/- grading. She also shared they don’t use C- or A+. Richard shared that he found three online.</p> <p>The Inquiry into this should include a faculty survey, focus group with students, discussions on the impacts to systems, updates needed - would be brought to the group in January. Dawn has spoken with Michelle to see about getting a student focus group together.</p> <p>Richard shared that he has heard from other instructors around the country that it made their life easier with +/-, but the info was</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>

	<p>anecdotal. He would like to see if there is some real data out there that can be used to quantify it.</p> <p>Eric shared that he had seen many other places that use +/- . Emilie shared that her personal college experience they used it.</p> <p>Dawn shared how it would affect students transferring – it would not affect their GPA. It would affect many other things like programs that state you have to have a C or better. There was more discussion about how it affects students when they transfer.</p> <p>This will benefit some students, but not everyone. Does it really benefit them on their GPA or does it just make them feel better? Is the +/- a way to help students realize where they really stand. Are we doing a disservice by letting students think their work was better than it really is?</p> <p><u>Faculty survey</u> - Dawn will send out an email asking for feedback from the group on what to have on the survey. She will get one put together to send out to faculty. Mary shared maybe we should ask if they would be willing to participate in a focus group.</p> <p>Lori shared the info she had found on the three other CC that use the +/- grading. More discussion on this.</p>	
<p>4. AR Updates: Richard</p>	<p>Richard: These items have made it through the process and are posted: CEU, Faculty Minimum Qualification, Use and Sale of Instructor-Authored Materials</p> <p>Discussion on the structure of the ARs that are listed on the website. Consensus was the list is difficult to find things. Maybe the group should suggest an alternative to this to the Webmaster.</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>
<p>NEW Business</p>		

<p>1. Plagiarism</p>	<p>Kevin: Kevin came to talk about how the college deals with plagiarism. There have been a number of instances come up. Being new he wasn't sure of the procedure that was in place to deal with it. He realized there was some confusion about the process and felt that students don't seem to know and/or understand what that means. Some students have seriously shared that they were taught to copy and paste from the internet. He feels that students don't seem to really understand the details and implications of the issue.</p> <p>Kevin is now including the student code of conduct in his syllabus. The question was raised as to who should be responsible to make sure that students are aware. He shared that last spring there was one student who offended multiple times. He feels that it needs to be clearer as to the consequences. The policy states that a student can be given an F if they are found to have committed plagiarism.</p> <p>Lori shared that it is in the student handbook as well as the Board Policy. Students are not required to sign anything. They are required to go to advising. They get a Navigator that walks them through their first term. The plagiarism issue has not been addressed directly with students as part of that process.</p> <p>The policy comes from Instruction. Lori shared that it is a bigger issue – how are students not aware when they are in an upper level class, how is it possible the students don't know and understand what this is?</p> <p>Kevin shared that he doesn't want tell others how to teach, but possibly there is an opportunity to tell students through the course objectives. Kevin shared that he has to warn around 10% of his students about this. Lori said that they only get two / three a year that come to the level that a hearing is needed.</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>
-----------------------------	--	---

	<p>Kevin would like to discuss it at in-service, to review the policy for a few minutes. Are students still doing this in 200 level classes because they have gotten away with it in the lower level courses? WR 115 is a pre-requisite and is a college level course. They should be aware by the time they get to that point. Gwen shared that the students are allowed to copy and paste, but they have to site it when they do it.</p> <p>Discussion that it seems to be prevalent and it appears that many warnings are being given. Kevin asked if it should be something that is documented when these warnings are taking place. How prevalent is it and is it the same students?</p> <p>Gwen asked if it goes up the chain of command, what happens to the student is caught doing this? Lori shared that there is a shared responsibility. If it is happening more than 2 or 3 times a year, why Student Services isn't hearing about it. There are procedures in place, but if we don't follow those procedures, then it doesn't get resolved.</p> <p>If the process were changed so that Student Services would be notified each time a student is warned, the policy would have to be revised. Lori shared that there would need to be some investigation into privacy and other issues, etc. This is a shared policy between Student Services and Instruction. Lori is looking at the model code of conduct, so we can update our policy. Lori recognized that our policies are fairly outdated. She would like to update to our current practice.</p> <p>Kevin questioned if there is a way to put it more up front, in the student's faces? Eric thought it needed to be something that was given to students right away, when they get here. There were discussions about how far back down the line in the education system that this is coming from, where the issue is happening and not being addressed.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Dawn shared that there are some documents that are only available for two people's eyes. It could be in student records, but not everyone should see it.</p> <p>The bigger issue is academic integrity?? Lori thinks that is the kind of discussion that we need to have. Maybe the Instructional Council or breakout sessions to discuss. At In-service we could have select faculty that could bring it up to discuss at a breakout session, maybe other issues related to student conduct, academic integrity, etc.</p>	
<p>2. Oregon Credit for Prior Learning Standards: Dawn</p>	<p>Dawn: Dawn shared that this is a conversation that has happened state wide. Basically the document is a draft for consideration that they want input from all the community colleges about the <u>eight standards</u>. They want an electronic survey to be completed by mid-December. Transferability is one of the issues.</p> <p>They want input from each of the colleges. Maybe this group could have a representative to work on this. Richard shared that our next meeting is before the survey deadline.</p> <p>Mary mentioned that institutions can choose what that would be. We can start at a basic level and add to it over the course of time. Dawn – the only cpls is the challenge test. All the other cpls are listed under non-traditional credit. Dawn shared what we currently have. The military piece is under non-traditional credit.</p> <p>NW says it is up to the schools to define what these are. Everyone has different ideas of what that is. This process would standardize what is what, across the state for all colleges.</p> <p>Currently we don't do a lot of nontraditional credit. Lori shared an example of how we do this. She shared the conversation she had heard about this, we have to have a mechanism to give credit/value to people who have experience/certifications that can be turned into</p>	<p>Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:</p>

	<p>credits on their transcripts. There was a discussion about who does the work to align the amount of previous time/work with the amount of credit value it would have. This would have to be done departmentally.</p> <p>Dawn shared that most schools will take a degree, but not the individual credits for these. They don't usually take the cpls. Clackamus has done a lot of work, but it was very specific to their school. This process would help standardize it for all schools.</p> <p><u>Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning:</u> Is this group where this would start for the Policy and Procedure? What happens if the student changes their major, would the credit need to be re-articulated? Lori shared that students will be shopping for the most bang for their buck. We should think about this evaluation of credits when developing the policy. We don't apply transfer credits to their transcript until they are an established student. The student would need to be declared.</p> <p>Lori asked about the wording. What is "high quality"? This could be very subjective. It needs to be identified to what that means.</p> <p><u>Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment:</u> This could be basically a portfolio. The student would have to provide sufficient evidence to be reviewed. This would be a lot of work. It would have to be based on a nationally recognized method to make the determination.</p> <p>Lori asked about how much of this we would see. Mary shared that it could be something that we might see from the military. It may be something that the military would start making the documentation available. We would note that dollars would be needed to get this work done. Chemekata has a class that helps students spend time working on getting the documentation for this for their portfolio.</p>	
--	--	--

Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure: The \$10 fee would be for the student services process and transcript fee. Costs will include student services, faculty work, and staff training.

Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription – Dawn noted that there are a lot of “mays” in this. There would need to be state wide commitment to pull this off. Gwen asked if something like this is adopted, this would be something that everyone would follow? We will still have to determine if something is transferable, looking at them individually. Dawn shared that if it is state wide, we should be able to accept it.

Standard 5: Data Collection & Reporting:

We have CIP codes for CPLS in Rogue. We will have the right information to pull it in for the reporting that is done. This one won't be difficult for us to do.

Standard 6: Faculty & Staff development:

Lori asked who would have a role in this. The faculty in a department would be a place to start, with curriculum approving it. There might be a person in each department that would be the go to person for this. The content masters are in the department. Maybe having someone in the curriculum office that would have the knowledge that could share the process with the departments/faculty.

**It was noted that all the standards should have a comment that notes that financial resources would need to be made available to implement these things. The state would most likely have a standardized training, but colleges would need resources to get people there.

Standard 7: Oversight – Is that what the ASPC is about? The oversight piece? Lori noted the part about student performance.

	<p>Dawn noted this has all been based on evidence based practices; we shouldn't have to prove it. Gwen shared that this standard seems like it is over-board. Maybe the evidence based practice info should be included with our comments. Lori also shared that it is good in theory, but it comes back to load, with a bunch of monitoring being brought back to people who already have a complete load.</p> <p><u>Standard 8: Transparency/Access:</u> We already have a web page dedicated to this information. PCC's page has a lot of information.</p> <p>We should revisit this in December. There may be more state wide input at that point.</p>	
Next Items to Address: All	All:	Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:
Adjournment	Adjournment at 4:30 pm	Motion: N/A 2nd: Action:

Next meeting: December 12th