

Academic Council Meeting
Minutes - Approved
Friday, November 18, 2016
10:00 A.M. – 1:00 P.M., WD 312

In attendance: Patty Allen, Judy Anderson, Jeff Bates, Crystal Clark, Christine Creagh, Julie Cronk, Sandy Drakatos, Holly Finnegan, Adam Keller, Tracy Koski, Scott Laslo, Mary Lewis, Melissa Logue, Marc Lord, Amy Ng, Ann Palazzo, Nancy Pine, Jack Popovich, Ben Pugno, Adele Wright

1) Early Alert, mid-term reporting, academic expectations (Teddi Lewis-Hotopp, Student Academic Success) – *handouts (2 – 1 printout and electronic, 1 printout only)*

Teddi and a colleague attending the meeting as guests presented some Early Alert data and the reporting/expectations around it a part of the college completion plan (handout distributed, titled “Columbus State Community College Completion Plan”). The main purpose of their presentation was to make AC members aware of how faculty can/should interact with Starfish and also to obtain faculty feedback and input.

The support and services that kick in as a result of Early Alert (to aid the student) has positive implications on Achieving the Dream and other student success initiatives.

Teddi indicated, based on survey data they collected in the community, that some of the students we lose (i.e. they don’t graduate but stop taking classes) and found that in some cases students who are eligible to graduate don’t apply because they don’t have the time to petition and fill out the paperwork., so an electronic version of a petition to graduate may result to address it.

Starfish has the capability for instructors to “contact retention specialist” which can be used when an instructor is trying to determine why a student has either dropped the course or stopped attending classes. Several members of the AC expressed a need, at the department level, to know why a student is struggling and/or has stopped participating in a given course.

Early Alert will contain an “outcome report” to track student responses/actions when they are contacted in regards to a progress alert in their course(s). Retention specialists will email and/or call a student and advise them about how to improve the performance (tutoring, meeting with advisor, study sessions, etc.).

The majority of the discussion between Teddi and the AC revolved around particular questions and answers in regards to how faculty can use Starfish, how the students can/should use Starfish, etc. Teddi and her colleague(s) indicated they are here to help faculty and the students and they should be contacted whenever help is needed. They will also be making trips to department meetings in the near future.

2) Approval of October 28, 2016 minutes – *handout (printout and electronic)*

Melissa Logue motioned to approve the minutes, with the addition of Ben Pugno as being present at the last meeting, Ann Palazzo seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

3) Blended learning proposal, Phase I plan (Judy and Ann Palazzo) - *handout (printout and electronic)*

Ann P. indicated that the research data (Appendix A of the handout) supports the notion that the Blended learning format is a successful format and a viable format for higher ed. The main objection that has come from the College is the cost requirement for delivering a course in the blended format. But the proposal has been approved by the college and the Phase 1 plan will start in the spring. Marty Maliwesky is now in Academic Affairs, and he will be handling the scheduling for blended courses, and is aware that there is work to be done in order to make the blended format more “workable” from a scheduling perspective. The plan includes classrooms set aside and designated for blended courses. Blended courses will also be scheduled during “prime time” hours to make them a more attractive option for students. The components of each Phase in the implementation of this plan is available upon request (Ann Palazzo or Judith Anderson). The group then had a lively discussion around different classroom strategies and policies for Blended courses. However, there was no need for a motion about the proposal; the agenda item was presented for information and discussion purposes only.

4) Science placement test and CCP (Judy)

Judy Anderson asked about the actual requirements for CCP students versus traditional CSCC students with respect to meeting the pre-requisites for taking college level science courses (Physics, Chemistry, and Biology). Dean Todd advised her to speak with Marc Lord as he knows how the CCP/ CSCC student pre-requisites are met. Marc informed the AC that high school students are able to meet pre-reqs based on the “old” way, which is successful completion of the high-school level science course. The new pre-reqs, which apply to CSCC students (but not those that are enrolled via CCP) require a baseline ACT or SAT score or passing the Science Placement Test. High schools are concerned with the amount of time required for students to take placement tests, and so they are able to use a standard that doesn’t require an ACT or SAT or placement test score.

5) Web project navigation (Judy)

With regard to the web project navigation for the College website redesign, Judy asked the committee if we could have a separate “bucket” for forms. The committee agreed to this suggestion. Judy showed the Online Faculty Handbook and asked whether, in the new web configuration, the pieces located in this link should be “sub-buckets.” Adele noted that this area needs a link for assessment. Adele also suggested that the buckets might be organized with the OAA committees in mind. The website needs to be intuitive and the “faculty” bucket needs to reflect all of our needs in that role. Judy asks that faculty share their ideas with her. Jeff notes that there will always be something missing—how will the web developers clean all that up? Judy answered that those offices responsible for the relevant areas will be expected to update those areas. Judy is still concerned about who will be responsible for updating the website (departments?) A committee might be needed to answer these questions; this will be revisited in Spring 2017.

6) New AQR Rubric: Implementation in Departments (Ann Palazzo)

The Digital Learning Committee voted to replace the college-wide AQR tool with the revised tool, and Ann Palazzo presented the new AQR to Academic Council. She discussed how the tool would be implemented in departments, and said that it can be modified to meet the specific needs of departments and used as part of the faculty observation report. Faculty are encouraged to use the AQR in their tenure and promotion portfolios along with their self-assessments and peer reviews. There was discussion about whether the AQR should be included in the observation section or instructional design section of the tenure and promotion portfolio. Holly Finnegan felt it should be in the instructional design section.

7) Dual Credit Procedures draft document (Scott Laslo) – *handout (electronic and printout)*

Scott asked the committee to recommend or ratify the Dual Credit Procedures draft. He asked faculty to examine, specifically, information related to the Instructor of Record (IR) and Compensation (Facilitated Model), items that will both be critical to the next round of CSEA negotiations. Marc L. questioned that contact time is not discussed in the document. Scott clarified that the contact hours are only for the facilitated model. The faculty member overseeing the uncredentialed high school instructor is different from the faculty member who is dual credit lead over the (credentialed) high school volunteer adjuncts. What is taught by the high school volunteer adjuncts must match what we teach in our classes to all of our students. Holly questioned about how and whether chairs understand that they must dedicate hours according to this document. Holly asked how it was decided how much money each department gets. Judy noted that there was a reassigned time committee in Arts & Sciences that examined this issue, but it was fairly contentious. It is up to faculty in departments to advocate for important issues like the oversight of dual credit courses. Because of the nature of dual credit (lack of preparation and a sound model or foundation for moving forward) the college has not set aside appropriate resources to support the initiative. Faculty question how and where the funds for dual credit are being allocated. Sandy: under the facilitated model, the CSCC instructor should be the person doing the assessments, not the uncredentialed high school teacher. Scott gave the history of this model, and said that the guidelines for this model Ohio Department of Higher Education have changed since the advent of dual credit. Scott notes that this draft Procedure attempts to put the responsibility back into the hands and under the purview of the CSCC instructors.

<p>Motion: Julie Cronk motioned to accept the Dual Credit Committee Dual Credit Procedure draft document and Amy Delorenzo seconded. The draft document was approved.</p>
--

8) Committee updates (All):

The recommendation was made to have Committee Co-Chairs submit reports prior to the meeting for review by Academic Council, and members agreed. Judy will create a mechanism for doing this for Spring 2017.

10) Meeting dates for Spring 2017 (Judy and all):

All on Friday from 10:00-12:00: February 10, March 24, April 21.

Other business (not on agenda):

- Judy is gathering all of the elements from the Color Work Groups to create Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Council.
- Judy will be gathering information regarding the members (who is serving, which committees have needs) and will send out a list.
- New elections will be held within committees this Spring, in accordance with the Guidelines and Procedures developed by the Membership Work Group and approved by Academic Council, for co-chairs who have served more than two years.

Agenda Items tabled for later:

- 9) Membership recruitment task force – call for volunteers (Judy)
- 11) Pink Work Group (Meetings) recommendations (Pink Work Group members) – *handout (printout and electronic)*
- 12) Green Work Group (Committees) recommendations (Green Work Group members) *handout (printout and electronic)*
- 13) Academic Council Communication Plan – brief discussion (Judy) – *handout (printout only)*

Submitted by,

Adam Keller
Ann Palazzo