

# **Agenda for Academic Council Co-Chairs Meeting**

**Friday Oct. 25<sup>th</sup>**

**CT107 10am-12pm**

## Items For Vote/Approval/Acceptance/Discussion

### **1. I-pad Pilot – brief test and set up**

### **2. Approval of Minutes from Sept. 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

**Academic Council Co-Chairs Meeting**

**September 27, 2013**

**WD 407**

**UNAPPROVED Minutes**

**In Attendance:** Alesa Mansfield, Deb Dyer, Judith Dann, Adele Wright, Crystal Clark, Judy Anderson, Jackie Teny, Mark Bocija, Scott Laslo, Eric Neubauer, Nancy Pine, Lisa Briggs, Antionette Perkins, Amy Delorenzo, Gilberto Serrano

**Ex-Officio:** Darrell Minor (OAA Faculty Committees co-coordinator); Tracy Little (OAA Faculty Committees co-coordinator), Adam Keller (CSEA)

**I.** **Approval of Minutes from August 30, 2013 meeting: Motion to approve minutes by Crystal Clark, Second Eric Neubauer: Motion to approve minutes with Changes from Darrell Minor Passed.**

**II.** **General Items and Updates:**

a. I-pad pilot – A block may be keeping peer to peer connection with the i-pads. Tracy is working on getting together with Joel to solve the issue. There may be a UDP port block and a UDP port exception will need to be requested. Deb Dyer suggested that we looking into 360 Cloud technology to post agendas, minutes.

b. Use of data from committees –Encouraged to have data to support items brought for a vote before the Academic Council and forwarded on to the Office of Academic Affairs.

c. Faculty Fellows Update – It was noted that although budget constraints may be a factor in not adding additional faculty fellows – that in the end the costs savings of having a faculty fellow doing administrative work that produces results over the costs of a consultant or other may in the end be a cost saving area as well as getting faculty more involved with leadership at the college. It was also noted that the reallocation of money to faculty fellow may advance many essential projects at the college.

- i. Faculty Fellow Role –A discussion was held regarding the role of the faculty fellows and it was noted that the Academic Council role was to clarify a policy or procedure – but that role often did get into the daily practice of implantation of those policy and procedure practices at the college. The Academic Council was created to have a role beyond mere policy and procedure, and to be actively engaged with practices that concern faculty and the overall academic area of the college.
- ii. The following committees indicated that they could use a faculty fellow:
  - 1. Tenure and Promotion
  - 2. Faculty Entry and Development
  - 3. Curriculum
  - 4. Service Learning
  - 5. Honors
- iii. Questions remain concerning the role of faculty fellows such as:
  - 1. Amount of reassigned time
  - 2. Can faculty fellows be ex-officio Academic Council Committee members and can they transition from a fellow to a committee position?
- d. Recognition of Dr. Kaufman on Columbus State Day – Update was provide and it was noted that Dr. Kaufman's contributions will be noted in the program and during the day's events.
- e. Interim and Faculty Chairperson Roles Update – CSEA is working toward ensuring that the transition of faculty to and from a Chair position will be more appealing. Details have not been worked out with HR but discussions are in the works. It was suggested that models from other colleges that have faculty in chair roles be researched to see how they cope with the conflict of interest of faculty in administrative roles.
- f. Pilots for Blended Course Learning with “lead” organizer and multiple adjuncts? Scott and Marc's committee (Instructional Success) are looking into ways of piloting such a model and the overall success rates of blended learning. It was mentioned that such a model may work well in some courses but not for others. The concern was raised that targeting adjuncts and faculty as a means to cut costs has become a “go-to” of sorts for the college, and that there has been a fixation on labor costs. Ideas to increase revenue at the college were briefly discussed. Many voiced the concern that cutting courses early before the term starts, only opening a limited amount of sections, and penalizing students for late registration even before the term starts are actually taking revenue away from the college and that maybe changing those practices would result in higher enrollment. Data was requested in regards to such concern.
- g. Study Abroad Update – Clary Act
- h. PLA (Prior Learning Assessments) possible ad hoc Committee? Committee members were asked to identify certain departments or programs that work regularly with PLA's in order to form an ad hoc committee to research the model.
- i. Academic Council Professional Development Funds Update – The announcement was made that funds can be transferred between OAA Committees if a committee does not intend to use their funds and another committee is in need of funds. The request was made to please let Darrell and Tracy know if you do not plan on using your funds, or if your committee is in need of funds. It was also noted that funds could not only be used for travel but to bring in speakers or professional development workshops.

- j. Embedded Advising Update – It was noted that faculty were generally in favor of the model as long as the advisors were informed and well integrated/physical located in the departments. Concerns were brought up as to the number of embedded advisors, for example some areas such as business have many students and programs and will be in need of more than one advisor. The concern was also raised that the process will not be well structured in its implementation since the issue has been brought up as a concern with contract negotiations. The concern being that administration will say they have solved the problem when in fact the process was not well defined or structured to fill departmental and program advising needs.
- k. AtD Update – Question was posed to council if they would like to get regular updates from the AtD team. It was noted that several members were active with the AtD and could serve as liaisons.
- l. Groupwise update – It was noted that groupwise will be replaced over holiday break. While software has been purchased to ensure that emails are not lost, it is recommended that faculty working on tenure and promotion portfolios print out important email prior to break. The Tenure and Promotion committee agreed to reinforce that advice. It was also suggested that training for archiving and retrieving email be offered by the college prior to the end of the term.
- m. Committee Membership and adding new members: Some committees are in the process of filling empty seats and the question arose concerning the process. The concern was that there was not enough flexibility in adding members if they were needed. A motion was made by Eric Neubauer and seconded by Deb Dyer to address this issue:

***Motion:** Each of the ten Office of Academic Affairs committees have the discretion to increase the number of members on their committee as needed proportionally from each Division up to a total of four members.*

*Motion was approved*

- III. **Blended Learning Task Force Recommendations** (see attached) The recommendations and forms were briefly discussed. The forms may fall under the purview of the Instructional Support Committee. Tracy will check with Anne Palazzo and Melissa Lueben to see if these are in the final format or if they are seeking feedback/recommendations before being put to a vote

#### IV. **Student Support Committee Items**

- a. Textbook Affordability Proposal Forms (see attached) Eric briefly discussed the form. *Adele made the motion to approve the forms pending edits. Eric - second.*  
*Motion was approved.*
- b. Textbook Affordability Content Development (see attached)

#### V. **Academic Pathways Items:**

- a. How many students transfer?/Data?
- b. Transfer Data Base (Sarah Lathrop) Crystal asked the council if they would be interested in a presentation from Sarah regarding the transfer data base. Many expressed the idea that it may be something that all faculty would be interested in and suggested that In-Service would be a possible format.

#### VI. **Curriculum Committee Items:**

- a. Update on Special Topics
  - i. Decision to put Special Topics on hold did not come from the Academic Council Curriculum Committee

ii. New Language Agreed upon in conjunction with Curriculum Committee

1. As many of you know Special Topics courses were briefly on hold as issues ensuring that students were aware that the majority of Special Topics courses were not part of any plans of study at the college and that transferability was limited were worked through.
  2. In conjunction with Administration and the Academic Council, wording to ensure that Special Topics courses purpose was clear was developed.
  3. Special Topics Courses can now be scheduled with the following wording included as part of any advertisements or information about the course: *"Students please note: Special Topics courses are not part of any plan of study at Columbus State Community College. These courses can only be taken as general elective credit. Very few Special Topic courses transfer to other institutions of higher learning as degree applicable credit and so unless students contact a receiving institution directly about degree applicability, they will serve themselves best by taking these courses for personal interest only."*
- b. 60 Hour Degree Limit and exemptions? There was extensive discussion about the administration's push to limit all/most programs to a 60-hour degree requirement. There was a great deal of concern expressed by faculty that a 60-hour degree in many programs is unrealistic and definitely not in the best interests of students seeking employment in that field after graduation. There was also concern about whether the reduction to 60 hours is a "mandate" (as it has evidently been presented to some faculty) or a "recommendation" (as the verbiage in the OBOR manual suggests), and what flexibility programs will have to waive the 60-hour requirement. There were also concerns expressed about the burden on the faculty of having to invest the time and effort to see how to restructure their programs (after just completing a restructuring due to the semester conversion) to meet a 60-hour requirement. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, is the fact that faculty strongly expressed their view that the curriculum falls under the purview of the faculty, and changes to the curriculum - including program requirements - must follow the normal curricular process and be led by faculty, subject to review by faculty committees, and not dictated by deans or other administrators.

The Academic Council had lost quorum at this point and: (from email to OAA Council Co-Chairs).

To that end, the Academic Council members drafted the following statement at Friday's meeting, with the suggestion that it be put to a vote of all members. If approved, the statement would be forwarded to Dr. Cooley, with copies to each of the three interim deans, all department chairpersons, and all full-time faculty.

Process: In order for it to be put to a vote, a member needs to first make the motion that it be put to a vote, and another member must second that motion. If that occurs, then we can allow time for additional discussion by the members (via email), and upon the conclusion of any additional discussion we can conduct an electronic vote via email.

So...is there a motion to consider the following language? Please "REPLY ALL" with any replies, or motions.

*Curriculum is under the purview of faculty and decisions regarding changes to the curriculum must come from the appropriate faculty committees. Specifically, the potential implementation of any recommendations of OBOR on the 60-hour degree requirements must only be made after first being reviewed by the appropriate faculty committees within each department. Given that faculty have just spent three years revamping the curriculum as part of the semester conversion process, and given that the current process for making curriculum changes is very cumbersome and bureaucratic, the Academic Council is recommending that any faculty work on making changes to degree requirements in order to adhere to the 60-hour recommendation should cease until faculty committees review the OBOR recommendation.*

- VII. **Academic Rules and Policies Item – Update on Policy 5-08 Graduation Requirements – Addition of colon to language resolved issue.**

- VIII. **Faculty Entry and Training Item:** Faculty vs Staff Training and Orientation
- IX. **Faculty Governance Committee** Updates and process for replacing Academic Council members – Darrell and Tracy will check on status of the committee.
- X. **Committee Updates**
- XI. **Adjournment**

Upcoming Meeting Dates: October 25<sup>th</sup> and November 22

### **3. Faculty Training Question from Rich James - Darrell**

### **4. Governance Committee Item– Review of Forms and Recommendations**

#### **Faculty Governance Structure and Process Recommendations**

Submitted by:

CSEA Faculty Governance Committee Members

Paul Carringer  
Ingrid Emch  
Lydia Gilmore  
Paul Graves

September 2013

- I. **Executive Summary**
- II. Guiding Objectives

This proposal was precipitated by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in the faculty contract. In addition to the guidelines set forth in the MOU, the faculty desired to achieve several key outcomes with the faculty governance structure and processes.

a. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in Faculty Contract

The 2011-2014 CSEA/CSCC Bargaining Contract included a Memorandum of Understanding that called for a faculty committee to recommend an appropriate model for faculty governance. The MOU in full states:

*The Association and the College agree to establish a committee to explore and identify an appropriate model for faculty governance and recommend changes in College Policy and Procedure that will provide for faculty governance in areas involving issues of an academic nature, including but not limited to:*

- Curriculum
- Assessment
- Student attainment and retention

*CSEA shall appoint four (4) faculty members to the committee, two (2) from the Arts & Sciences Division and two (2) from the Career and Technical Division. The committee will commence its work no later than the start of Winter Quarter 2012. The committee will make a recommendation of a faculty governance model to the President of the College.*

b. Key Goals and Outcomes

The proposed structure and processes were developed with several key goals and desired outcomes in mind. These goals and outcomes include:

- To develop a sense of trust for faculty, as well as staff and administration, in the faculty governance system, especially as it pertains to issues related to curriculum, assessment and student success.
- To provide scheduled opportunities for review, feedback and recommended changes regarding the OAA committee and Shared Governance structure.
- To provide the college with a governance system that is grounded in thoughtful deliberation and based on evidence to advance the college's mission, vision and values.
- To clarify the scope of responsibility for each of the 10 OAA committees.
- To clarify the role of committee members, the committee co-chairs, and the OAA Faculty Fellow.
- To establish terms of service for committee members, committee co-chairs and the OAA Faculty Fellow.
- To develop democratic processes that are fair, equitable and effective for committee member selection, committee co-chair selection, and the OAA Faculty Fellow selection.
- To develop effective processes for assigning agenda items to OAA committees and the OAA co-chairs leadership group.
- To develop effective processes for communicating OAA committee and OAA co-chairs leadership group recommendations and outcomes.

### III. Data Gathering Process

Information was collected from faculty, OAA Co-Chairs, the current OAA Faculty Fellow, the American Association of Community Colleges Convention sessions, CSEA leadership, and the literature available in published and/or electronic form that outlines the faculty governance practices at other institutions across the nation.

During this data collection period, the OAA committees and Policy Council structure and practices were being refined and also served as a source of information for successful practices and gaps in process. The evolutionary nature of governance at the college will be ongoing, and this proposal recognizes the need to continuously review the governance process and structure for needed improvements.

#### a. Literature Review

Many key issues related to faculty governance were identified through a review of the literature. A summary of key considerations to an effective faculty governance structure and process is presented within the academic literature presented below.

Governance is a function of structure and of how people act within that structure. (Schuetz, P., "Key Resources on Community College Governance." In *New Directions for Community Colleges*, Spring, 2008, 141, 91-98.)

"Effective governance is defined as the structure and processes that achieve desired outcomes via a decision-making process grounded in thoughtful deliberation and evidence" (Amey, M.J., Jessup-Anger, E., and Jessup-Anger, J., "Community College Governance: What Matters and Why?." In *New Directions for Community Colleges*, Spring, 2008, 141, 5-14.)

Certain characteristics and attributes are common to effective community college governance models. They include "clarity, openness, fairness, competence, and stability". (Fryer, T.W., and Lovas, J.C. *Leadership in Governance: Creating Conditions for Successful Decision Making in the Community College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.)

Governance is increasingly important to organizational functioning as "effective governance provides institutional purpose, clarifies strategic direction, identifies priorities, and exerts sufficient control to manage outcomes" (Amey and VanDerLinden, 2002).

Beyond organizational functioning, "factors such as culture, trust, involvement, and sense making affect effectiveness as much as structures" (Amey, 2005; Pope and Miller, 2005; Pope 2004)

"Many factors affect governance structures and processes. Identifying a clear and operational mission when demands and expectations compete with one another is one significant force. Other forces include conflicting organizational goals, federal and state legislation, funding, judicial involvement, a resurgence in faculty participation, public scrutiny, local politics, community needs, cost containment, accountability, compliance mandates, changing student markets, competition, performance funding, attitudes and values of key decision makers, institutional culture, and board members" (Amey, 2005; Amey and VanDerLinden, 2002; Levin, 1998).

Communication within the system and between constituent groups is highlighted as being important. "Faculty must understand institutional communication strategies as well as structural reforms if they are to be more effective in contributing to the college's mission" (Tierney and Minor, 2004).

"Leadership, trust, and relationships supersede structures and processes in effective decision making" and "campuses can build effective governance through an investment in leadership development and through mechanisms that nurture faculty, staff, and administrative relationships" (Kezar, 2004).

"Consensus building and gathering input from various constituents, which are hallmarks of team leadership, improve governance processes" (Evans, 1999).

## References

Amey, M. J. "Community College Governance: What Matters and Why?" *New Directions For Community Colleges*, 141, 5-14.

Amey, M. J. "Leadership as Learning: Conceptualizing the Process." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 2005, 29(9), 689-704.

Amey, M. J. and VanDerLinden, K. E. *The Institutional Context of Community College Administration*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 2002.

Evans, J. P. "Benefits and Barriers to Shared Authority." In M. Miller (ed.), *Responsive Academic Decision Making Involving Faculty in Higher Education Governance*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums, 1999.

Gayle, D. J., Tewarie, B., and White, Jr., A.Q. *Governance in the Twenty-First Century University: Approaches to Effective Leadership and Strategic Management*. ASHE Higher Education Report, no. 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Kezar, A. "What Is More Effective Governance: Relationships, Trust, and Leadership or Structures and Formal Processes?" In W. G. Tierney and V. M. Lachuga (eds.), *Restructuring Shared Governance in Higher Education*. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 127. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Levin, J. S. "Making Sense of Organizational Change." In J. S. Levin (ed.), *Organizational Change and the Community College*. New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 102. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Pope, M. L. "A Conceptual Framework of Faculty Trust and Participation in Governance." In W. G. Tierney and V. M. Lechuga (eds.), *Restructuring Shared Governance in Higher Education*. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 127. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Pope, M. L., and Miller, M. T. "Leading from the Inside Out: Learned Respect for Academic Culture Through Shared Governance." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 2005, 29(9), 745-756.

Schuetz, P. "Key Resources on Community College Governance." *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 141. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008,.

Tierney, W. G., and Minor, J. T. "A Cultural Perspective on Communication and Governance." In W. G. Tierney and V. M. Lachuga (eds.) *Restructuring Shared Governance in Higher Education*. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 127. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

b. OAA Co-Chairs

The Faculty Governance Committee met with the OAA Co-Chairs at one of their meetings in Spring 2013 to collect information about what aspects of the new OAA committee system were working and what outstanding needs should be addressed and how they should be addressed. Issues like committee member elections, terms of service, committee charges, forms, and committee leadership were discussed. The proposal addresses each of these concerns identified by the OAA Co-Chairs.

After the proposal was drafted, the OAA Co-Chairs were again invited to inform the process by reviewing the document, discussing as a group any desired changes, and making recommendations for edits.

c. Faculty Survey

In Summer 2013, the Faculty Governance Committee developed an electronic questionnaire to all full-time faculty at the college. The objective of the questionnaire was to collect information regarding the level of satisfaction with the current OAA structure. The questionnaire, consisting of 22 questions, was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Due to hurdles with the IRB and the time-consuming nature of conducting a faculty survey with IRB support, the survey was never distributed.

d. American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Convention

A committee member attended the 2013 national convention of the American Association of Community Colleges, held in April in San Francisco, CA.

Specific to the work of the committee, the Participatory Governance System session was informative to our work. In this full session, the following characteristics of participatory systems were identified and discussed. Please note that the topics and outcomes discussed fit well with the review of the literature.

- In a participatory system, directing boards call all college constituency groups to be active partners in the governance of the institution.
- The charge of these boards is for participatory governance where all constituent groups engage in thoughtful deliberation and decision-making within a process that leads to recommendations being made to the college president.
- The main goal is mutual agreement so that the mission, vision, and values of the institution are protected and advanced.

The presenters at a session entitled “Literature and North American Systems Review” did a comprehensive literature review and a national systems review to

explore how other community colleges create, manage, and revise successful systems of governance. Some of their findings include:

- There are three or four types of governance structures displayed.
  - Constituent Councils – Groups of concerned people within the institution including students, faculty (full-time and adjunct), staff and administration.
  - Campus Councils – Location-based groups including campuses, branches, and specific functional sites such as airports, trade buildings, and workforce development sites.
  - Functional Councils – Natural functions that are a part of the institutional business model including student services, libraries, safety forces and facilities management.
  - Hybrid – Combinations of structures that are specific to institutions and the functioning of the individual institution. An example is: Constituent/Campus/Functional in ways that allow issues to move up the system and across the system as needed. This could be something like a constituent group (fulltime faculty) that interacts with a functional group (Physical Plant) that is location specific (airport).
- With the development of a system of governance that is institutionally-specific, a variety of questions can be asked and issues addressed. Those discussed at the AACC convention session are presented here.
  - Participation: What groups should have opportunities to participate in a governance system? (Faculty – Fulltime and/or Adjunct? Staff? Administrative?) How will they be engaged in the process of governance system development, growth, and institutionalization?
  - Structure: What structure fits best? Here it is important to ask not just how the system works, but what parts of the system need cross functional/cross constituent group oversight?
  - Goals: What are the institutional goals for governance?
  - Management and Training: How can the system of governance be managed? Some institutions have a staffed office to handle the administrative duties of the governance system. Who will the manager of the system report to?
  - Nominations and Elections: What is the best way for the institution to handle nominations and elections? Some larger institutions utilize election software and outside election management providers to allow for ease of nomination, election, and reporting as well as maintaining integrity of the system.
  - Length of Service: What will the length of service be? One year? Two years? More? A combination?
  - Training: How will newly elected or appointed members be trained and who will do the training? Will there be mandatory training for new members to the governance system? Who will be responsible for the training?

- Dispute Resolution: Will there be an impartial person or office to handle disputes within the system? If yes, who does that person report to? What is their authority? Can the president override decisions?

To summarize, the development of an effective system of governance must be institutionally specific. It must be driven by the goals of the institution for governance and must reflect the mission, vision, and values established. The system needs oversight and management but with an open and transparent process that builds trust within and between all constituents groups.

e. Faculty Leadership for CSEA

Faculty leaders of CSEA were consulted to identify issues that should be addressed. CSEA leadership not only provided expertise regarding contractual obligations, but they also were able to provide a historical context regarding faculty governance issues at the College. (Ask Kevin or Darrell to provide more about how some of these issues informed our goals of trust, communication, etc.)

f. OAA Faculty Fellow

In Autumn 2012, a Faculty Fellow was selected by the college to coordinate the work of the 10 OAA committees. The Faculty Governance Committee met with the OAA Faculty Fellow and had multiple follow-up conversations regarding successes and challenges with the new OAA committee and Shared Governance structure. Issues such as term limits, committee member elections and membership, communication processes, etc. were informed by the OAA Faculty Fellow.

#### IV. Faculty Governance Structure

The formation of 10 faculty committees (OAA committees) in 2012 officially introduced a new structure for faculty governance at the college. The goal of this proposal is to retain that 10-committee structure but to also further define key processes and requirements for the committee membership, leadership and facilitation.

a. OAA Committees

The 10 OAA committees include:

- Academic Pathways Committee
- Academic Rules and Policy Committee
- Assessment Committee

- Curriculum Committee
- Faculty Entry, Training and Professional Development Committee
- Honors Committee
- Instructional Success Committee
- Student Support Committee (see recommendations below)
- Service Learning Committee
- Tenure and Promotion Process Committee

The charters for each of these committees are included in the Appendices of this proposal and each outlines the purpose, scope, key stakeholders, and objectives for the committee.

Upon recommendation of the OAA Co-Chairs, additional committees may be added to accommodate the work faculty must do related to curriculum, assessment, and student success. These recommendations may be submitted to the Office of Shared Governance and copied to the OAA Faculty Fellow for review. (NOTE: Is this how we want this to work?)

b. OAA Committee Co-Chairs

Each OAA committee has two co-chairs who represent the committees on the Academic Council (see recommendations below), the voting body for faculty shared governance. One co-chair is an Arts & Sciences faculty member from the committee and one co-chair is a Career & Technology faculty member from the committee. A job description for the OAA Committee Co-Chairs is included in the Appendices of this proposal.

c. OAA Faculty Fellow

The OAA Faculty Fellow is appointed by the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs to facilitate the work of the 10 OAA committees and the committee co-chairs leadership group. A job description for the OAA Faculty Fellow is included in the Appendices of this proposal. The OAA Faculty Fellow has some administrative authority in the faculty governance process.

When a new OAA Faculty Fellow is up for appointment, the position should be announced by the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and applications accepted over a minimum of one month. Application reviews will be done by committee including two OAA Co-Chairs (1 A&S, 1 C&T), one CSEA representative, and one Office of Shared Governance representative.

Committee recommendations will be submitted to the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, who will determine the final appointment. Candidates not selected will be notified by the Senior Vice-President of Academic Affairs and provided with a rationale for the decision and suggestions for future applications and needed expertise.

d. Recommendations for Changes to Structure

The Faculty Governance Committee recommends that the 10 OAA committees, the OAA Co-Chairs leadership group, and the OAA Faculty Fellow remain active but that the following name changes are made:

- Change the name of the Student Support Committee so that it is different than the Policy Council committee of the same name
- Change the name of the OAA Co-Chairs group to Faculty Council instead of Academic Council to identify this more clearly as the faculty leadership group for Shared Governance.
- Change the name of the OAA Faculty Fellow to Faculty Council Administrator.

e. Faculty Council and Policy Council Interactions

The Faculty Council is the leadership committee of OAA Co-Chairs that is charged with decision-making for the OAA faculty committees.

Recommendations from the Faculty Council go to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for approval. (How are recommendations submitted, and do they always go to the OAA VP?)

The Policy Council includes four standing committees: Technology, Student Support, Human Capacity Development, and Fiscal Resources and Facilities. Each Policy Council committee has faculty representatives, and CSEA has a faculty representative appointed to Policy Council. Appointed Representatives also include the Associate V.P. of Academic Affairs responsible for Shared Governance, the Faculty Council Administrator, and a Faculty Council representative.

- Conflict-Resolution Guidelines: Conference Committee

### **Reconciling Differences Between the Academic Council, Policy Council and Standing Committees**

Conference committees are created to try to reach a compromise when the Councils and the associated committees approved policies that are in conflict with other governance groups. The model for conference committees comes from the legislative branch of the federal and state governments.

If the policy in question is in conflict with policies of councils or committees other than the policy-originating council or committee, the council or committee of origination for the policy in question

may ask a conference committee to resolve the differences between the conflicted councils or committees. The conference committee may only accept, reject, or amend the disputed policies for recommendation.

If the conference committee can't come to an agreement, either council may request a free conference committee. A free conference committee can propose new policy in its entirety and is not confined to debating the policy in-question. However, the committee may only consider policies that are within the scope of the title of the original policy in-question.

A conference committee may consider only disputed policies. The committee may recommend:

- acceptance or rejection of each disputed policy in its entirety; or
- further amendment of the disputed policies.

Copies of the engrossed policy and the disputed amendments are provided to the conference committee members.

## Membership

A conference committee is a joint committee traditionally made up of a three-member committee from each council.

The leadership of the Academic Council appoints the Academic Council members for the conference committee and the Policy Council leadership appoints the Policy Council members for the conference committee.

## Meetings

The Governance Office sets up all conference committee meetings and provides secretarial support. Committee staff is notified by e-mail that they have been assigned to a conference committee and should also receive the standard committee notice.

The presiding officers of the conference committees representing both the Academic and Policy Councils must agree on the time and place of all joint conference committee meetings. This information must be announced publicly to the entire college community and Unions that represent members of the college body.

A conference committee meeting is an open meeting but not a public hearing. The committee must keep minutes and must allow the public to attend, but it does not accept public comment.

## Voting

Because conference committees are joint meetings of two committees, the members from each council vote separately. A majority of each council's committee must agree before any action may be taken, unless otherwise specified by the rules of the council.

If there is a tie vote in a conference committee on the question of what to recommend the matter must be referred to the full committee from which the proposal came for consideration without recommendation.

## Reports

A conference committee must report the results of its deliberations. If the conference committee doesn't reach agreement or its report is not adopted, the amendments are considered rejected.

### V. Faculty Governance Committee Membership

The 10 OAA committees currently have between six and 12 members each. Volunteer members were initially appointed by the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Faculty Council Administrator.

#### a. Membership Elections and Appointments - Recommendations

Committees may include up to 14 members (8 elected and up to 6 appointed by faculty on the committee through a vote – even number of elected members from C&T and A&S divisions and even number of appointed members from C&T and A&S divisions). The Office of Shared Governance, with the assistance of the Faculty Council Administrator, will coordinate elections at the same time each year as elections for Policy Council occur (should be at the beginning of each academic year in August). For first elections after this proposal is accepted, there will be some faculty elected for one-year terms, some for two-year terms, and some for three-year terms to accommodate a rolling membership and balance between divisions.

Each committee may appoint up to 6 members to meet the workload of the committee. Appointees are selected via consensus by the committee members. Typically, appointments would come from prior members who were productive but who did not get elected for another term (including co-chairs who still have another year of their two-year role), from faculty who are identified as having expertise related to committee initiatives, or from faculty who directly express an interest in joining the committee

There are no term limits on committee membership. Therefore, a faculty member may be elected as a member of any OAA committee for as many years as he/she wishes to serve.

b. Membership Terms of Service

Standard terms for committee membership, including appointments, are three years. Elections will be staggered so that one-third of members on each committee is elected each year. OAA committee members may also serve on Policy Council simultaneously.

c. Mid-year vacancies

Mid-year vacancies on committees will be handled by appointment only. Appointments to mid-year vacancies would complete the term of service for the vacated faculty member.

d. Summer Service

Faculty serving on OAA committees are not required to participate in committee work if they do not accept a summer contract. If the faculty member is working any hours during summer semester, OAA committee work will continue during that summer semester. If the faculty member is not working any hours during summer semester, a temporary appointment may be considered by the committee if necessary; however, the faculty committee member may return to service on the committee at the beginning of Autumn Semester if the three-year terms of service are not yet completed.

VI. Faculty Council (OAA Committee Co-Chairs) Selection and Terms of Service

a. Elections and Terms of Service

Co-chairs are elected at the beginning of each academic year by the members of their committee for 2-year terms of service. Elections are staggered so that one year the C&T co-chair is elected and the following year the A&S co-chair is elected. Co-chairs may serve a maximum of two consecutive 2-year terms.

We strongly recommend that faculty serve on a committee for one year prior to serving as a co-chair for the committee but acknowledge that sometimes this may not be practical.

b. Terms of Service

The terms of service for Faculty Council members are two years.

Note that terms of service for membership must be met along with terms of service for co-chair. Co-chairs need to be elected or appointed if their membership term is up during the middle of their two-year term as co-chair.

During the first two years upon approval of these recommendations, faculty currently serving in the role of co-chairs may maintain their role, if desired. Elections of co-chairs will begin as needed but no later than two years from implementation of this process.

c. Reassigned Time

**Co-chairs will receive four hours** of reassigned time for each semester during which they serve on the Faculty Council.

d. Mid-year vacancies

Mid-year vacancies for co-chairs will be handled by a new vote within the committee that has the vacancy. Elected co-chairs to mid-year vacancies would complete the term of service for the vacated faculty co-chair.

e. Summer Service

Faculty serving as co-chairs are not required to participate in committee work if they do not accept a summer contract. If the faculty member is working any hours during summer semester, OAA co-chair and committee work will continue during that summer semester. If the faculty member is not working any hours during summer semester, a temporary appointment may be considered by the committee if necessary; however, the faculty committee member may return to service on the committee at the beginning of Autumn Semester if the two-year terms of service are not yet completed.

## VII. Issue Identification, Master Tracking, Assignment, and Recommendation Process

a. Submitting Issues for Consideration

o Form – INTAKE FORM

See attached form for an example.

o Process

Any faculty member, staff member or administrator may submit an issue for consideration to the Office of Shared Governance. (Maybe see the form used by Cathy Hatfield for annual requests to see how that would work for our purposes.) This form would be completed by the person identifying the issue and would be submitted to the Office of Shared Governance and copied to the Faculty Council Administrator

- Expedited Process

Define an “expedited” process for issues that are time sensitive to the college

b. Issues Master Tracking

- Form – POLICY MILESTONES AND PROGRESS TEMPLATE (Attached)

It is recommended that the issues master tracking form developed for the Switch-to-Semesters process be utilized for the master tracking of issues and policy additions/revisions/deletions.

c. Submitting Recommendations to the VP of Academic Affairs

- Form

Need to revise form currently used (not consistently) by Faculty Council for recommendations. Judy Anderson drafted the current form. Revise as needed and require its use by all.

- Process

The form is submitted to the VP of Academic Affairs with supplemental documentation to fully explain the recommendation.

d. Communicating Status of Current Issues and Outcomes of Recommendations

- Shared Governance Website

The Shared Governance website will include agendas and minutes of all OAA committee, Faculty Council and Policy Council meetings accessible to all employees at the college. (Note that Darrell said the faculty want this all together for both Policy Council and Faculty Council.)

- Monthly Status Updates from Faculty Council Administrator

The Faculty Council Administrator will provide monthly email updates on all active issues discussed in the Faculty Council. These emails will be sent to all faculty, staff and administrators at the college and also posted on the Shared Governance Website. (See Referral Form Attached for Example)

- Semester Faculty Governance Updates from VP of Academic Affairs

Need to develop a system for communicating, at least once per semester, the outcomes of all recommendations. Let's talk about whether this comes from FCA or VP OAA

The Faculty Council Administrator will maintain a list of all recommendations and collect from the VP of Academic Affairs the outcomes of the recommendations. These outcomes may include policy and procedure revisions or additions, new initiatives, and possibly rationale for why a recommendation was not implemented.

These communications will be posted to the Shared Governance website as well as emailed to all faculty, staff and administrators.

#### VIII. Communications Process Between Councils (Flesh this out)

- a. Need to track in writing via forms the communication back and forth regarding issues discussed in both Policy Council and Faculty Council.
- b. The forms with signatures of committee co-chairs/chairs will be maintained, distributed and managed by Office of Shared Governance (Cathy Hatfield).

#### IX. Faculty Governance Review Committee - Develop a systematic review and schedule

#### X. Summary

- Considerations and Recommendations – review the major changes/additions to the existing process
- New structure presents an opportunity to the institution
- Inclusive place for college planning
- Inclusive communication within and between constituency groups
- Provides timely public input on major issues and discussions
- Provides a future focus approach to planning for the college
- Allows for consistent monitoring of the system and opportunities for adjustment with the inclusion of all voices in the college

#### Other issues????

- Evaluation process (Annual Self-evaluations???)

## **4. Faculty Entry Training and Professional Development Committee Items**

- a. Sabbatical Policy – Faculty Entry, Training, and Professional Development**  
**Introduction to Sabbatical Policy (5.03) and Procedure Revision**

### **Background/subcommittee members**

In Spring Semester 2013, the Faculty Entry, Training, and Professional Development Committee formed a subcommittee at the request of the College to review the Sabbatical Policy (5.03) and Procedure for Faculty, both for standard and non-standard sabbaticals. Members of the subcommittee included FETPD members Judy Anderson (Co-Chair), Tim Davis, and Chuck Wilson. Ingrid Emch, who worked extensively on the Sabbatical article in the 2011-2014 faculty contract, was also a member of the subcommittee.

### **The subcommittee's work**

The subcommittee's review was intended to ensure that the policy and procedure: 1) aligned with Article 33 of the faculty contract, and 2) had an efficient and logical time frame for requests, review, approval, and appeal, and 3) ensured a transparent and impartial selection process. In addition, the subcommittee wanted the policy and procedure to reflect funding limitations on sabbaticals imposed by the College.

### **Timeline for the revisions**

The subcommittee's work began in March of 2013 and was completed in October of 2013. On October 16, the policy and procedure was forwarded to the full Faculty Entry, Training, and Professional Development committee for review. Upon their approval, the policy and procedure was forwarded to the Academic Council Faculty Fellows for distribution to the full Academic Council for review before their October 25, 2013, meeting. The decision of the Academic Council from this meeting will be immediately forwarded to the College for discussion at the November 1, 2013, Board meeting.

### **A. SEMESTER SABBATICALS**

- (1) Faculty members are eligible to apply for sabbatical leave ~~at the beginning of their AS EARLY AS AUTUMN SEMESTER OF THEIR SIXTH~~ ~~seventh~~ year of full-time FACULTY STATUS service for granted sabbaticals scheduled to begin during the faculty member's ~~SEVENTH~~ ~~eighth~~ year of full-time FACULTY STATUS service. Subsequent semester sabbaticals may be applied for after an additional five full years for faculty who will have a minimum of six years of additional service after the satisfactory completion of the previous granted sabbatical. Faculty members who wish to be considered for sabbatical leave are required to submit the "Application for Sabbatical Leave" along with DOCUMENTATION IN SUPPORT OF HOW THE SABBATICAL WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THE CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, AS WELL AS DEPARTMENTAL, DIVISIONAL AND COLLEGE GOALS AND

INITIATIVES. THIS SHOULD BE DONE AT LEAST TWO SEMESTERS PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF LEAVE. APPLICATIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED ~~form~~ to the DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS AND THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT Office ~~on or before Tuesday of~~ WITHIN THE FIRST TWO WEEKS ~~week two of~~ THE Autumn Quarter SEMESTER for initial eligibility screening. In light of recent budgetary constraints, it is recommended that faculty apply by Autumn of the academic year prior to the year of the requested sabbatical. ~~Sabbatical leave forms are available from division deans or in the Human Resources Office.~~ For the purposes of this procedure, THE TIMELINE BEGINS DURING THE WEEK THAT THE ~~“week two of Autumn Quarter is defined as “the week immediately following the week in which Autumn Quarter SEMESTER officially begins REGARDLESS IF THE SEMESTER BEGINS ON A MONDAY.”~~

(2)

- (2) DURING WEEK THREE OF THE SEMESTER, DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS WILL CONFIRM INITIAL ELIGIBILITY. CANDIDATES WHO DO NOT MEET ELIGIBILITY WILL BE NOTIFIED IN WRITING OF THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS THAT WERE NOT MET. DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS WILL SCHEDULE A MEETING OF THE DEPARTMENTAL SABBATICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK.

Sabbatical leave candidates who fail to meet initial eligibility requirements may appeal to the VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS Provost for a review of their "Application for Sabbatical Leave." Appeals must be SUBMITTED ~~provided in writing and received by the Provost's office by Friday of~~ TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS DURING ~~week three~~ FOUR of THE Autumn Quarter SEMESTER. The VICE PRESIDENT ~~Provost~~ will review the candidate's request for appeal and return a decision to the candidate DURING ~~Friday of~~ week FIVE of Autumn Quarter THE SEMESTER. If the appeal is granted, the Departmental Sabbatical Review Committee must consider this request for sabbatical leave along with any other requests.

3

- 3 DURING ~~By Tuesday of~~ week FOUR OF THE ~~in Autumn Quarter,~~ SEMESTER, department chairpersons will convene a meeting of THE DEPARTMENTAL SABBATICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE, WHICH CONSISTS OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND AT LEAST THREE TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS ELECTED BY FULL-TIME, TENURE TRACK FACULTY FROM ~~members of the~~ sabbatical candidate's department, to consider the candidate's request for sabbatical leave. The faculty member receiving the most votes will automatically serve on the Division Level Sabbatical Review Committee. THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE DIVISION DEAN OF WHETHER THE SABBATICAL SHOULD BE APPROVED DURING WEEK FIVE OF THE SEMESTER ~~decide on a departmental recommendation, and forward both the department's and the department chairperson's recommendations to the division dean.~~

- (a) In reviewing the candidate's request for sabbatical leave, the ~~department~~ DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE will consider a variety of factors, including proposed sabbatical activities and their relationship to the candidate's professional development needs as well as their utility in furthering departmental goals and objectives. Candidates are encouraged to fully disclose known details of their proposed sabbatical **WITHIN THEIR APPLICATION AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS**, especially unique opportunities or external sources of funding that would reflect positively on the candidate's application for sabbatical leave.
- (b) THE FACULTY ON THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL UTILIZE THE SABBATICAL EVALUATION RUBRIC AS A TOOL TO HELP DETERMINE WHETHER APPLICATIONS FOR SABBATICALS SHOULD BE APPROVED. CANDIDATES MUST HAVE A MINIMUM RANKING OF "ACCEPTABLE" BY TWO-THIRDS OF THE DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ALL CATEGORIES TO RECEIVE A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION AND HAVE THEIR REQUEST *forwarded to the Divisional Committee.*
- (4) DURING ~~By Tuesday of week eight in SIX OF THE Autumn Quarter~~ SEMESTER, the DIVISION dean(S) AND THE DIVISIONAL SABBATICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE, WHICH IS MADE UP OF REPRESENTATIVES SELECTED BY EACH DEPARTMENTAL SABBATICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE, (AS ESTABLISHED IN A(3))will review the candidate's sabbatical request AND WILL MAKE ~~and add his/her~~ THEIR recommendation OF ~~to~~ the candidate's REQUEST FOR SABBATICAL. "~~Application for Sabbaticeal Leave~~" form. THE DIVISIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL UTILIZE the SABBATICAL EVALUATION RUBRIC AS A TOOL TO HELP DETERMINE WHETHER APPLICATIONS FOR SABBATICALS SHOULD BE APPROVED. CANDIDATES MUST HAVE A MINIMUM RANKING OF "ACCEPTABLE" BY TWO-THIRDS OF THE DIVISION COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ALL CATEGORIES TO RECEIVE A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION AND HAVE THEIR REQUEST *forwarded to the appropriate DEAN. Final approval from the dean is ~~are~~ required for a candidate to be granted sabbatical leave.*

(A)The department chairperson and/or the division dean(s) will meet with the candidates who are not approved to receive *sabbatical leave to discuss the reasons for which their applications were not approved*. Applications not approved for sabbatical leave will be returned to faculty members by THE END OF ~~Friday of week eight~~ SIX OF THE ~~Autumn Quarter~~ SEMESTER. Department chairpersons and deans should inform and/or remind candidates of leave OR OTHER policies AND BENEFITS at the college that might also be used to assist the candidate in meeting his/her professional development goals.

(B)IN THE EVENT THAT THERE ARE MORE AFFIRMATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS THAN CAN BE FUNDED BY THE COLLEGE, THE

DIVISIONAL SABBATICAL COMMITTEE WILL REVIEW AND RANK THE SABBATICAL APPLICATIONS. APPLICATION RANKINGS WILL BE GIVEN TO THE DIVISION DEAN DURING WEEK SEVEN—~~in Autumn Quarter~~ OF THE SEMESTER. THE DIVISION DEAN WILL NOTIFY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ~~Provost~~ OF THE HIGHEST RANKED APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE DIVISION AND WILL FORWARD ALL APPROVED APPLICATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS. In light of recent budgetary constraints, it is recommended that faculty apply by Autumn of the academic year prior to the year of the requested sabbatical.

- (5) In the event that a faculty member wishes to appeal the recommendation OF his/her application for sabbatical, he/she must submit a written request for appeal, along with his/her sabbatical application, to the ~~Provost~~ VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS by THE END OF ~~Wednesday of week nine~~ EIGHT of THE ~~Autumn Quarter~~ SEMESTER.
- (a) The ~~Provost~~ VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS will appoint a review panel consisting of one faculty member, one chairperson, and one dean, each selected from outside the candidate's department and division.
- (b) The panel will review the candidate's application and documentation for sabbatical leave and forward its recommendation to the ~~Provost~~ VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ~~Wednesday of~~ BY THE END OF week NINE OF THE ~~ten~~ ~~in Autumn Quarter~~ SEMESTER. The ~~Provost~~ VICE PRESIDENT will review the recommendations of the candidate's department, chairperson, dean, and review panel and MAKE ~~render~~ a final recommendation BY THE END OF ~~Tuesday of~~ week TEN eleven of THE ~~Autumn Quarter~~ SEMESTER.
- (b) ~~The Provost VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS will notify the appropriate division dean of his/her recommendation. If the Provost VICE PRESIDENT decides to recommend a requested sabbatical, candidates will be notified in accordance with paragraph (8) of this procedure.~~
- (c) ~~If the Provost VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS decides not to recommend a requested sabbatical, S/HE the Provost will notify the candidate of his/her decision by Friday of THE END OF week THIRTEEN eleven of THE Autumn SEMESTER Quarter.~~
- (7) ~~In the event that there are more affirmative recommendations than can be funded by the college, the division dean will select three faculty members from the division's promotion committee to review and rank the sabbatical applications. Application rankings will be given to the division dean by Friday of week eleven in Autumn Quarter. The division dean will notify the Provost of the highest ranked applications within the division, and will forward all approved applications to the Provost . Sabbatical leave awardees will be notified in accordance with paragraph (8) of this procedure.~~

(86) By Friday of By the end of week TEN OF twelve in Autumn THE SEMESTER Quarter, the Provost VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS will notify sabbatical leave awardees, department chairpersons, deans, and the President of final recommendations to their requests for sabbaticals.

- (7) DURING WEEK ELEVEN OF THE SEMESTER, THE VICE PRESIDENT OR HIS/HER DESIGNEE WILL NOTIFY SABBATICAL CANDIDATES WHETHER THEIR REQUEST HAS BEEN APPROVED AND IF SO, FOR WHICH SEMESTER(S) SABBATICALS WERE GRANTED.
- (8) A REPRESENTATIVE OF The Human Resources Office will schedule a meeting with all sabbatical recipients, at least one quarter prior to the beginning of their approved sabbatical leave, to review all personnel related RELEVANT WAGE AND BENEFIT details related to the sabbatical, including SUCH AS payroll adjustments, continuation of benefits, AND accumulation of service credit, etc.

#### B. NON-STANDARD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SABBATICALS

- (1) FACULTY MEMBERS ARE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR NON-STANDARD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SABBATICAL LEAVE AT ANY TIME BEGINNING AFTER AT LEAST ONE YEAR OF FULL-TIME FACULTY STATUS. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SABBATICALS ARE LIMITED TO NO MORE THAN ONE OPPORTUNITY WITHIN TWO ACADEMIC YEARS AND CAN BE TAKEN DURING ANY SEMESTER (INCLUDING SUMMER) IN WHICH THE FACULTY MEMBER IS UNDER CONTRACT.
- (2) FACULTY MEMBERS WHO WISH TO BE CONSIDERED FOR NON-STANDARD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SABBATICAL LEAVE ARE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THE "APPLICATION FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE" ALONG WITH DOCUMENTATION IN SUPPORT OF HOW THE SABBATICAL WILL SUPPORT THE CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, AS WELL AS DEPARTMENT, DIVISIONAL AND COLLEGE GOALS AND INITIATIVES TO THEIR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS AT LEAST TWO MONTHS PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF LEAVE. IF AN OPPORTUNITY ARISES THAT PREVENTS A TWO-MONTH NOTICE, SPECIAL PERMISSION FROM THE DIVISION DEAN WILL BE REQUIRED. However, in light of recent budgetary constraints, it is recommended that faculty apply by Autumn of the academic year prior to the year of the requested sabbatical.
- (3) WITHIN ONE WEEK FROM THE DATE OF APPLICATION, DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS WILL CONFIRM ELIGIBILITY. CANDIDATES WHO DO NOT MEET ELIGIBILITY WILL BE NOTIFIED IN WRITING OF THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS THAT WERE NOT MET. DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

WILL SCHEDULE A MEETING OF THE DEPARTMENTAL SABBATICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK.

SABBATICAL LEAVE CANDIDATES WHO FAIL TO MEET INITIAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS MAY APPEAL TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS FOR A REVIEW OF THEIR "APPLICATION FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE." APPEALS MUST BE SUBMITTED IN WRITING TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS WITHIN ONE WEEK OF INELIGIBILITY NOTICE. THE VICE PRESIDENT WILL REVIEW THE CANDIDATE'S REQUEST FOR APPEAL AND RETURN A DECISION TO THE CANDIDATE WITHIN ONE WEEK. CANDIDATES WHO ARE FOUND TO MEET INITIAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS ON APPEAL MUST PROCEED THROUGH THE APPLICATION PROCESS PER PARAGRAPH (2).

- (4) AN EXPEDITED PROCESS WILL BE USED TO REVIEW NON-STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SABBATICAL LEAVES. WITHIN ONE WEEK OF THE SABBATICAL APPLICATION, DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS WILL CONVENE A MEETING OF THE STANDING DEPARTMENTAL SABBATICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AS ESTABLISHED IN Section A.(3), , TO CONSIDER THE CANDIDATE'S REQUEST FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE. THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE DIVISION DEAN OF WHETHER THE SABBATICAL SHOULD BE APPROVED.

(A) IN REVIEWING THE CANDIDATE'S REQUEST FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE, THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL CONSIDER A VARIETY OF FACTORS, INCLUDING PROPOSED SABBATICAL ACTIVITIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE CANDIDATE'S PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS AS WELL AS THEIR UTILITY IN FURTHERING DEPARTMENTAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. CANDIDATES ARE ENCOURAGED TO FULLY DISCLOSE KNOWN DETAILS OF THEIR PROPOSED SABBATICAL WITHIN THEIR APPLICATION AND SUPPORTING MATERIALS, ESPECIALLY UNIQUE OPPORTUNITIES OR EXTERNAL SOURCES OF FUNDING THAT WOULD REFLECT POSITIVELY ON THE CANDIDATE'S APPLICATION FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE.

(B) THE DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL UTILIZE A SABBATICAL EVALUATION RUBRIC AS A TOOL TO DETERMINE WHETHER APPLICATIONS FOR SABBATICALS SHOULD BE APPROVED. CANDIDATES MUST HAVE A MINIMUM RANKING OF "ACCEPTABLE" BY THE COMMITTEE IN ALL CATEGORIES TO RECEIVE A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION.

(5) WITHIN THREE WEEKS OF THE APPLICATION FOR SABBATICAL, THE DEAN AND THE DIVISIONAL SABBATICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AS ESTABLISHED IN Section A.(4) WILL REVIEW THE CANDIDATE'S SABBATICAL REQUEST AND WILL MAKE THEIR RECOMMENDATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S REQUEST FOR SABBATICAL.

A) THE DIVISIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE WILL UTILIZE A SABBATICAL EVALUATION RUBRIC AS A TOOL TO DETERMINE WHETHER APPLICATIONS FOR SABBATICALS SHOULD BE APPROVED. CANDIDATES MUST HAVE MINIMUM RANKING OF "ACCEPTABLE" BY THE COMMITTEE IN ALL CATEGORIES TO RECEIVE A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION. IN THE EVENT THAT THERE ARE MORE AFFIRMATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS THAN CAN BE FUNDED BY THE COLLEGE, THE DIVISIONAL SABBATICAL COMMITTEE WILL REVIEW AND RANK THE SABBATICAL APPLICATIONS. THE DIVISION DEAN WILL NOTIFY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OF THE HIGHEST RANKED APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE DIVISION AND WILL FORWARD ALL APPROVED APPLICATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS.

(B) FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CANDIDATE'S DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE, DIVISIONAL COMMITTEE AND DEAN ARE REQUIRED FOR A CANDIDATE TO BE GRANTED SABBATICAL LEAVE.

(6) THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON AND/OR THE DIVISION DEAN WILL MEET WITH THE CANDIDATES WHO ARE NOT APPROVED TO RECEIVE SABBATICAL LEAVE TO DISCUSS THE REASONS FOR WHICH THEIR APPLICATIONS WERE NOT APPROVED. APPLICATIONS NOT APPROVED FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE WILL BE

RETURNED TO FACULTY MEMBERS WITHIN FOUR WEEKS OF INITIAL APPLICATION. DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS AND DEANS SHOULD INFORM AND/OR REMIND CANDIDATES OF LEAVE OR OTHER POLICIES AND BENEFITS AT THE COLLEGE THAT MIGHT ALSO BE USED TO ASSIST THE CANDIDATE IN MEETING HIS/HER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS.

(7) SABBATICAL LEAVE AWARDEES WILL BE NOTIFIED by THE VICE PRESIDENT OR HIS/HER DESIGNEE that THEIR REQUEST HAS BEEN APPROVED.

(8) In the event that a faculty member wishes to appeal the recommendation to his/her application for sabbatical, he/she must submit a written request for appeal, along with his/her sabbatical application, to the VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS WITHIN ONE WEEK OF NOTIFICATION OF SABBATICAL DENIAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS will appoint a review panel consisting of one faculty member, one chairperson, and one dean, each selected from outside the candidate's department and division. The panel will review the candidate's application and documentation for sabbatical leave and forward its recommendation to the VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS within one week of the request for appeal. . The VICE PRESIDENT will review the recommendations of the candidate's department, chairperson, dean, and review panel and MAKE a final recommendation WITHIN ONE MONTH OF THE INITIAL APPLICATION.

(9) A REPRESENTATIVE OF The Human Resources Office will schedule a meeting with all sabbatical recipients, ~~at least one quarter~~ prior to the beginning of their approved sabbatical leave, to review ~~all personnel related~~ RELEVANT WAGE AND BENEFIT details related to the sabbatical, ~~including~~ SUCH AS payroll adjustments, continuation of benefits, AND accumulation of service credit, etc.

## Columbus State Sabbatical Evaluation Rubric

(To be used by both Department and Division Committees.)

Category	5 - Exemplary	3 - Acceptable	1 – Not Developed
Supports College, Divisional, or Department Goals as well as Initiatives	Clearly identifiable relationship between the sabbatical and the goals of the college, division or department. Outcomes intentionally exemplify mission, vision, and values. Proposal is exceptionally grounded in theory, previous scholarly work, artistic	Relationship of sabbatical to the support of College, Division or Department is measurable, meaningful and defined. Outcomes are clearly stated and relate to mission, vision, and values. Proposal is adequately grounded in theory, previous scholarly work, artistic development, or professional practice.	Ability of sabbatical to support College, Division, or Department goals is not clearly defined or identifiable. Learning outcomes are not clearly stated and cannot be related to mission, vision and values. Proposal lacks grounding in theory, previous scholarly work, artistic development, or professional practice.

	development, or professional practice.		development, or professional
Professional Growth and Development	Contributions to professional development are exceptionally meaningful.	Contributions to professional development are important, clearly articulated, and practical.	Contributions to professional development are not clearly articulated or not appropriate for faculty member's position.
Proposal Planning Attributes	Proposal reflects exceptional planning and methods to achieve outcomes.	Proposal is clear and well-developed with an appropriate plan to achieve outcomes.	Proposal does not reflect planning and/or methods for achieving outcomes.
Feasibility of Sabbatical Request	Sabbatical would reflect an exceptional use of college time and resources.	Proposal is feasible and in line with realities of College, Division, or Department resources.	Proposal is not clearly feasible or not a realistic reflection of time and available resources.

## b. Professional Development Funds – forms and documents

### Process for Professional Development Funds:

1. Academic Council committee member completes Request for Academic Council Professional Development Funds Information Form (2013-2014)
2. Committee member submits form to Academic Council Committee by date specified by the committee.
3. Committee may approve the entire amount requested, approve part of the amount requested or disapprove the request.
4. Committee co-chair updates spreadsheet.
5. Committee co-chair returns the form to committee member with decision and amount approved.
6. Committee member then completes Travel Request Form or Registration Fees Form, whichever is appropriate, and submits it along with the signed copy of Academic Council Professional Development Funds Information Form (2013-2014) to the VP of Academic Affairs office. \*\*\* If the committee member chooses not to attend the event they must notify the academic council committee co-chair and VP of Academic Affairs office as soon as possible, so the money allocated can be added back into the available funds.
7. Once travel is complete, the committee member will submit their Travel Expense form to the co-chair of committee. The committee co-chair must ensure that the total reimbursement requested does not exceed the amount that was approved by the committee before signing off and forwarding that form to the VP Academic Affairs office.

## **Additional Information**

- A committee may choose to spend all or a portion of their allocated funds for paying an invited speaker to provide professional development to the entire committee. The Academic Council committee would need to approve this request.

## **Request for Academic Council Professional Development Funds Information Form (2013-2014)**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

*Each member of an academic council committee requesting funds for expenses related to professional development activities, such as travel or conference registration fees, must complete and submit this form, along with any other appropriate college request forms (e.g., Travel Request form), to the academic council committee for their approval.*

---

---

Note that in the following, *event* refers to any professional development experience, including but not limited to conferences, meetings, workshops, or seminars, for which travel or professional development funds are being requested.

1. Which of the following best describes the reason for attending the event?

to gather / obtain professional development that would enhance the work of our committee

to obtain professional development or continuing education related to pedagogy/techniques/technologies

to gather/discuss ideas or generate support towards initiatives to promote student success and the College's mission

other (please concisely describe)

---

2. Is the attendee providing significant leadership/facilitation/partnership of the overall event? Yes\_\_ No\_\_

3. Has the attendee been invited or selected to present a session at the event? Yes\_\_ No\_\_

4. Will the attendee be a voting delegate at the business portion of the event? Yes\_\_ No\_\_

5. Is the attendee an officer of the organization involved in (sponsoring, hosting, etc.) the event? Yes\_\_ No\_\_

6. Will the attendee preside/facilitate/moderate at least one session at the event? Yes\_\_ No\_\_

7. In order to attend the event, how many substitute hours should be needed to cover your classes? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Is the attendee willing to share what they learn from the event upon their return? Yes\_\_ No\_\_

9. State the name, location, date of, and reimbursed cost of any CSCC-funded events you have attended within the past eighteen months. If more space is needed, please continue your listing on the back of this page.

Event Name	Location (city/state)	Date(s)	Reimbursed Cost

10. Provide any other information that you think is pertinent in determining whether your funding request will be granted. Please be concise. If more space is needed, please continue on the back of this page.

Continuation of responses for items 9 or 10, if needed:

---

---

How much are you requesting? \$\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

Faculty Submitting Request (print)

Faculty Submitting Request (signature)

Date

---

---

---

---

**Academic Council Committee Decision:**

Approved

Not Approved

Amount approved: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Rationale:

---

Academic Council Committee Representative (print)

Academic Council Committee Representative (signature)      Date

---

---

**CO-CHAIR of Academic Council Committee:** After the professional development activity has been completed, and the travel expense form has been submitted, one of the co-chairs will report how much of the approved amount was actually used by the committee member to VP of Academic Affairs office. This must not exceed the above approved amount.

Amount of approved funds used: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

## **5. Honors Committee Item – Honors Graduation Requirements and Explanation**

### Honors Graduation Requirements Explanation and Information:

The Honors Committee drafted the attached program graduation requirements, and would like for the co-chairs to review and approve at the meeting on Friday. It is important for everyone to realize that these are the requirements for graduating from the honors program, and for special recognition at graduation and on a student's transcript. Students who qualify for admission to the honors program, but choose only to take honors courses will be permitted to do so (courses will be individually marked on their transcripts).

Honors activities/events are considered extra-curricular and co-curricular (important for allowing students to engage outside the classroom). Activities will include such things as: active membership in a student club/organization; attendance at special guest lectures, or Blue Print Workshops; participation in field trips and/or service learning activities;

# **CSCC Honors Program Graduation Requirements**

---

Honors Program members who complete their studies at Columbus State Community College and meet the following qualifications become eligible for final Honors Program acknowledgement on transcripts and/or diplomas as well as recognition at graduation:

- Earn an Associate Degree at Columbus State Community College while an active member, and;
- Earn an A or B in at least fifteen (15) credit hours of Honors courses (including Honors versions of COLS 1100 and ENGL 1100\*), and;
- Maintain a cumulative GPA of at least 3.4 in all college-level coursework, and;
- Attend a minimum of six (6) Honors Program sanctioned events and/or service activities.

In extreme circumstances, adjustments to these requirements may be approved at the sole discretion of the OAA Honors Committee.

*\*Preferred Pathways Scholars and students having already earned credit for COLS 1100 and/or ENGL 1100 prior to entering the Honors Program will have this requirement waived; however, these students will still be required to complete 15 hours of honors-level coursework to receive recognition as an “Honors Graduate.”*

## **6. Instructional Success Committee Item – Blended Learning Task Force Recommendations**

***Adopted by OAA Co-Chairs meeting on 5/11/12***

# **OAA Faculty Committee Decisions/Actions/Recommendations**

---

The following form has been developed to document recommendations, actions and/or decisions, taken by an OAA Faculty Committee, that impact the College, its policies, processes, and/or faculty-related work. Please attach any back-up documents when submitting this form.

OAA Committee Name: Instructional Success

Date: October 22, 2013

Submitted by: Scott Laslo

Was this decision/action/recommendation made by a quorum of the Committee? (A quorum is defined as having 60% of committee members present, evenly divided between Career and Tech and Arts and Sciences Division committee members; no proxies permitted.) **Yes**

Was this decision/action/recommendation recorded in official minutes of the Committee? **Yes**

Are any attachments included with this form?

1. Blended Learning Task Force Recommendations
- 

The Instructional Success Committee was asked to review the recommendation made by the Blended learning task force (BLTF) regarding the college’s Blended Learning Initiative, specifically to support consistent standards for course selection, creation, training and mentorship, as well as data collection. We have reviewed and discussed the recommendations. We support the BLTF recommendation on the Blended Learning Initiative.

If our recommendation is adopted, the Blended Learning Initiative will be implemented across the college.

Does the Committee recommend that their decision/action/recommendation be subject to further review by the OAA co-chairs at a regularly scheduled committee meeting? **Yes**

If "yes," in addition to further review at the OAA co-chair committee meeting, does the committee's decision/action/recommendation need additional faculty input? **No**

## **7. Student Support Committee – Advising Statement**

*The Student Support Committee strongly endorses an expanded system of academic/program advising that best supports student needs, and correspondingly addresses the advising duties of many faculty. The College should expand its general academic and program-specific advising substantially, to meet or exceed best practice standards for advising in an urban community college environment. Specifically, the College should hire additional advisors; embed advisors within specific departments/programs and/or designate advisors to specific programs; provide additional training to current advisors in degree/program specifics; and appropriately compensate faculty for advising duties. The Student Support Committee urges the College to take these steps in recognition that robust, expert advising via meaningful one-on-one student interaction plays a central role in supporting our students' success.*

## **8. Promotion and Tenure Process Committee – Any feedback on Promotion and Tenure Fellow?**

## **9. Assessment Committee Item – Program Review**

### **Program Review (DRAFT: 6/7/13)**

**Definition:** Program Review is a comprehensive overview of programs at the College based on both internal and external data. It is an essential part of institutional planning and development that assures that the college is meeting the changing needs of the community it serves. Academic programs shall be defined, for the purpose of this procedure, as any group of courses in similar subject areas. This is typically identified as groups of courses using the same alpha, however, some programs may combine several alphas if this combination leads to a single set of outcomes. At the outset of this process, all program alpha(s) will be determined so that data sets can be prepared.

**Cycle:** Each program will complete a program review a minimum of every 4 years. An initial, staggered schedule will be identified but may be subject to change by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**Purpose:** Columbus State Community College is the fundamental higher education gateway in central Ohio. As such, it is critical that our academic programs be strategically connected to the needs and

priorities of the state. Career and Technical programs need to be responsive to the workforce needs of regional businesses and industries by graduating students who are work-ready. The College's Arts and Sciences degrees and pathways should provide a seamless transition to partner colleges and universities so that AA/AS courses apply directly to the required courses for a bachelor's degree. All academic programs should be a platform for success for the students and the college needs to support success strategies in all courses. Students require clear pathways to complete certificates and/or degrees, therefore, a careful review is needed to identify and remove barriers that impede academic progression. As stewards of public funds, Columbus State must design programs for quality, and for optimal efficiency, both for the student and the college.

**Data Sources:** All data is to reflect the three academic years prior to the submission date of the report. All revenue/expense data sets will be prepared by Business and Administrative Services. Program enrollment data will be accessed from reports prepared by Institutional Effectiveness. The primary source of industry and employment data will be accessed from the Senior Executive Director of the Center for Workforce Development and supplemented through the use of the EMSI system. Four year articulation data should come from the Articulation and Transfer Office in Academic Affairs. Arts and Sciences' chairpersons will work with the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs directing college transfer, to collect information about transfer students who have completed courses/programs at Columbus State as well as performance indicators expected from transfer institutions for each major. The Faculty Contract Administrator will be the data source for all information about faculty hours per semester, inclusive of reassigned time.

**Roles and Responsibilities:** The chairperson over each program will gather the data sets needed to complete the program review report as well as work with the faculty to identify a work team. The faculty work team will assemble the report and narratives by analyzing the data and using their insights into the specific subject matter and trends to provide any needed information or explanation of data. Both the faculty work team and the chairperson will sign off on the report before it is passed on to the appropriate dean. An administrative review team will be composed of the dean over the program area, both associate vice presidents for academic affairs and an external industry or four year college partner who has specific knowledge of the program area. The Dean for Distance Learning, Dean of the Delaware Campus, Director of Dual Enrollment and the Director for Budget and Financial Planning, and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will consult on the reviews as needed. The administrative review team will provide comments, recommendations, and identify any needed action items. Final sign off of each report will be by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

## PROGRAM REVIEW FORM

**Date:**

**Program:**

**Department:**

**(D) indicates data that will be provided by one of the sources identified under the data source section**

**(P) indicates information that the program should provide**

**Faculty Data:**

- Number of Full-time (D)
- Number of Adjunct (D)
- Types and Amount of Reassigned Time Used (D)
- Credential Requirements for Subjects Taught (P)
- Staffing Challenges/ Future Needs (P)

**Staff**

- Staff Positions (D)
- Challenges/ Future Needs (P)

**Program Data:**

- Average Class Size (lecture) (D)
- Average Class Size and Number of Faculty in Each Section (lab, clinical, seminar, other) (D)
- Enrollment Trend for the last 3 yrs. (program or selected series of courses) (D)
- Identify the Delivery Modality for Each Course and the Percent of the Courses in the Program Being Offered in Each Modality (classroom traditional, blended or distance learning). Indicate When the Last Academic Quality Review Was Completed for Each Blended or DL Course. (D)
- Identify if the program has external professional accreditation, licensing board approval or is recognized by a state or national certification organization. Provide information about the programs approval status, last review and next required report and/or visit. (P)
- Number of Courses in the Program (taught by the program faculty) (P)
- Number of Students in Each Program Cohort (for selective admission programs) (P)
- Identify the Relevance of Each Course (technical, basic-related, general education) in the Program to Either Workplace Competencies, Licensure/Certification/Accreditation, or Transfer. (P)
- Identify Any High School Activity Related to the Program Such as Tech Prep, CTAG or Dual Enrollment. (P)
- Identify Any Industry Based Activities Related to the Program, Such as Certificates Specifically for an Identified Industry Partner. (P)
- Identify the Types of Supplemental Information, Specific to this Program, in the Library to Support Student Success. (P)
- Identify What Steps Have Been Taken by this Program to Insure Textbook/Resource Affordability for the Students (P)

Provide an analysis of data and trends in this section

**Student Success Data:**

- Number of Students Completing Certificates (D)
- Number of Students Completing Degrees (D)
- Identify the Diversity Breakdown of Students in the Program (D)
- Number of Students Retained vs Number That Did Not Persist (D)
- Number of New Students Entering the Program or With Each Start of the Sequence (D)
- For Non-Selective Admission Programs, the Number of New Declared Majors in the Program at the Beginning of Each Academic Year (D)
- Number of Students Completing Each Course with a “C” or Better (D)
- Number of Students Receiving a W, D or E in Each Course (D)
- Identify Transfer Student Numbers (D)
- If a Course is Offered In Multiple Modalities, Compare the Success Rate of Student Taking Each Type of Modality, Traditional, Blended or DL. (D)
- Identify Tutoring Opportunities for Your Students (D)
- Identify Any Barriers for Students Choosing to be Admitted to and/or Progress Through the Program (P)
- Identify Internships, Co-ops or Other Job Placements Opportunities (P)

- Identify Industry Partners That Have Hired Program Students (P)
- Identify the Percent of Graduates Per Year Who Have Been Employed in the Program Field of Study or Closely Related Field. (P)
- Identify Non-Academic Engagement Activities That May Positively Influence Retention (P)

Provide an analysis of data and trends in this section

#### **Financial/Resource Data:**

- Revenue Minus Expense of Program for Identified Series of Courses (D)
- Identify Specific Laboratory Space Allocated to the Program and Percent of Use Per Week in Relation to the Possible Teaching Hrs. (D)
- Anticipated Capital Equipment Needs for the Next Three Years (P)
- Anticipated Maintenance and Repair Cost for the Next Three Years (P)
- Anticipated Changes in Lab Fees or Technology Fees for the Next Three Years (P)
- Anticipated Changes in Software or other Licensure Costs in the Next Three Years (P)
- Describe All Measures Implemented That Contained Cost and/or Improved Efficiency (P)
- Identify Additional Space Needs and Program Data that Supports the Need (P)
- Identify Any Additional Funding Sources for the Program (P)

Provide an analysis of data and trends in this section

#### **Forecasting/Future Look:**

- Identify What Four Year Pathways Exist for Students Completing Your Programs (D)
- Identify the Wage Potential of Your Student's Upon Completion of Your Program (D)
- For C&T Programs, Identify Industry Trends Related to Your Program and Jobs For Which Students Completing Your Certificates and Degrees Will Be Qualified (P)
- Discuss how the C&T Programs Align With Unique Needs of the Region (P)
- Discuss the Indicators That Show That the Program Outcomes Are Aligned to the Needs of the Industry, and/or License/Professional Accreditation Bodies (P)
- For A&S Programs, Identify Projected Transfer Opportunities for Students Completing Your Program and Credits the Student Will Receive at Four Transfer Institutions (P)

Provide an analysis of data and trends in this section

#### **Other:**

- What is the Student Demand for the Program (D)
- Compare and Discuss Program Requirements, Including Pre-Requisites and Admission Criteria with 4 Peer Institutions for C&T Programs and Destination Colleges for AA and AS Programs (P)
- What are the Major Strengths of the Program (P)
- What are the Major Concerns or Challenges of the Program (P)
- What are the Program Goals/Priorities for the Next Three Years and what Internal and External Data Supports These Directions (P)
- What is the Growth Potential of the Program (P)
- What are Constraints to Program Growth (P)
- Identify Grant Opportunities for the Program (P)

Provide an analysis of the data and trends in this section

#### **Summary Analysis:**

<b>Reviewer Comments:</b>
<b>Action Items:</b>
<b>Recommendations:</b>

## **Items for Updates/Calls for Volunteers/Requests**

1. Prior Learning Assessments Ad-hoc Committee – Crystal has volunteered to lead the charge and several faculty and chairpersons have expressed interest in sharing their knowledge and/or participating on the committee. Please contact Crystal if you are interested in serving on the committee. It will report to Jack and Crystal's committee
  
2. HLC Conference Delegation and other Conference Attendance – Anyone interested in attended in the HLC conference with the Academic Council Professional Development funds? This is highly encouraged. Please contact Darrell or Tracy if you are interested.
  
3. Request for Volunteer to serve on Search Committees – The Academic Council may be able to have a member on the search committees for the Deans and other administrative positions that also call for a CSEA representative. Any volunteers? Please contact Tracy or Darrell if you are interested.
  
4. Embedded Advising Updates – Administration seems to continue to support a system of embedded advising. The projected number will be 4 for A &S and 6 or more for C &T. Details have yet to have been announced.
  
5. Textbook Affordability and Digital Content Update – Forms have been distributed to faculty. Faculty are encouraged to apply.
  
6. Achieving the Dream/Student Success Council Update –Achieving the Dream is now – The Student Support Council. Proposals from the Academic Council Committees are really

encouraged for Student Success Council Funding. Details are in the process of being released. Please contact Tracy or Darrell if you have a project you would like to propose for funding.

7. Pilots for Dual Enrollment Courses Request. Some high schools have requested Dual Enrollment sections, however, qualified high school teachers have not been available. With that in mind, in order to meet the demand – pilots are being requested that would essentially function as a hybrid/blended course. A full-time instructor would get paid to design/organize the course shell and supervise high school teachers in the grading of material and in-class exercises. Please contact Tracy, Darrell or Shawn Casey (Chair of the Dual Enrollment Sub-Committee)
8. Update on Faculty to Chairperson Role –CSEA, and HR are in process of working out outstanding concerns to make the process of moving from a faculty to a chairperson role easier. Some of those concerns involved resolving conflicts surrounding the supervision of other faculty, moving back into faculty positions, and compensation.
9. Update on OBOR 60 Hour Rule – CSEA realized a detailed statement on this matter. Currently programs are only being asked to identify areas in which accreditation from outside bodies may be impacted.
10. Update on Program Review – Polly is/has meeting/met with several Academic Council Committees. Polly was directed by Jack to structure the Program Review around HLC standards.
11. Update on new Special Topics Subcommittee Many concerns and exceptions came forth from faculty and chairs concerning the Special Topics course statement. It is clear that further investigation needs to happen. The statement still stands for now, however, several departments, courses have been granted exceptions as details are worked out. Marc Lord has agreed to chair a sub-committee on this issue. Please contact Tracy, Darrell or Marc Lord if you are interested in serving on this sub-committee.
12. Learning Management System – Two Learning Management Systems are currently under review: Canvas and a New Updated Blackboard. When you log into blackboard there is an announcement and link to start reviewing the courses. Currently no decisions have been made and the college is in the data/information/feedback stage. Jack conveyed a message from Tom Erney indicating that they would like to ensure everyone that this is only an investigation stage through Nov. 15. Timelines are shifting on the matter.

#### New Items

Upcoming Meeting: Friday Nov. 22<sup>nd</sup> 10am-12pm