

Academic Council Meeting
Minutes - approved
Friday, October 27, 2017
10:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M., WD 312

ATTENDANCE: Adam Keller (minute taker), Judith Anderson, Tywan Banks, Martin Blaine, Crystal Clark, Holly Finnegan, Lydia Gilmore, Mary Lewis, Melissa Logue, Marc Lord, Jennifer Nardone, Amy Ng, Ben Pugno, Rita Rice, Cathy Ritterbusch, Rachael Romain, Adele Wright.

1) Minutes From 9-22-17 Meeting:

There was a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting by Melissa Logue. The motion was seconded by Jennifer Nardone, and the motion was passed unanimously with no abstentions.

2) OER Update – committee report (*Ann P., Judy A.*)

Jennifer stated their committee still has many questions for the administration before moving forward with their recommendations. How are OER's defined? What is the current status of the digitization effort(s) in relation to OER's? Some of members mentioned they have attended several of the library's OER workshops, but that the information provided is repetitious, and not particularly informative with regards to using OER's in your own courses, other than "Google stuff" and pull things from the Internet.

Judy asked that if anyone has any concerns or comments, they should forward them to Judy, Ann, or Jennifer so they can be shared with the committee.

3) Student evaluations project update (*Ann P., Judy A.*)

Judy said they met with Tonja Morgan, Project Manager for the EvaluationKit implementation project, and some staff from IT who will be the management team to oversee student evaluations. Crystal asked for clarification about whether or not Teddi Lewis-Hotopp was the project manager, and Judy explained that Teddi's office (Student Academic Success) will be the administrative area in charge of the student evaluations and will take over once the evaluations are up and running, at which point Tonja M. will step away from the project.

Judy warned that faculty need to be careful about who gets to see the results of the student evaluations, as this is one of the issues the faculty workgroup is currently working through. Part of this is because it took quite long time before IT came to the table to work on this project, and now that the evaluations is now in the "project management" pipeline, this issue of who sees and uses these student evaluations is still up in the air. Currently the choices about where

the results of the evaluations for adjunct, ACF, and tenure-track faculty will go once they are completed by students. The work group looking at this question is in agreement that adjunct and ACF evaluations should go to the chair, but the question of whether or not tenure-track faculty evaluations should go to the chair is still being discussed. For which faculty do they go to the chair? Jack Cooley's opinion is that only adjuncts and ACF should have their evaluations pass through the chair's hands, and TT can receive their evaluations directly and share as they choose. There is also the question about when the evaluations will be employed. This has not yet been determined.

Judy again informed the group that the Academic Council needs to make one or more recommendations about this process, otherwise the administration will end up making the decisions and moving the project forward without sufficient faculty input on the decisions that have yet to be made.

FOLLOW UP: Judy will communicate with Ann and/or email the evaluation team and ask to set up a meeting with faculty on the team in order to know (definitively) about what decisions the administration are planning to implement, and to discuss the decision about who gets the evaluations once they are compiled and released from term to term.

4) Testing Center updates from Student Support Committee (*Amy N., Catherine R.*)

Dr. Wisse, Director of Student Support and Advising, emailed Judy recently about the need to make changes to college P&P regarding testing center workflow. Once change is for all testing center requests to be submitted electronically, with this as the only option by Autumn 2018.

Melissa Logue indicated the testing center is also going to eventually implement a whole new "system." She also informed the group that people should let Michelle Teasley of Testing Services know if they would like to be on the Testing Center Advisory committee so the faculty have a voice in the changes and decisions that will be made. The testing center does want the faculty input, but the administration will make decisions in the absence of this input if faculty are not involved. Currently Eric Neubauer is currently involved on the advisory committee, and he will be meeting as part of an ad-hoc committee with Dr. Wisse, Michelle Teasley, and others, to discuss Testing Services issues. More information will follow on this ongoing concern.

5) CCP Policy and Procedure update – *review and comment stage (Rachael R., Tywan B.; Judy A.)*

Judy reminded everyone that several years ago, the Dual Enrollment committee began working on recommendations for what is now CC+ and would eventually recommend Policy and Procedure changes and proposals around CC+ business at the College.

On October 26, 2017, there was an email to all Shared Governance stakeholders about a "notice and comment" period for Policy 5-10 and procedure 5-20(D) which is language about

CC+. This is premature since the faculty contract is still under negotiation, which has extensive language for CC+. Anyone with comments or concerns about the current uncertainty of the faculty contract should email Sarah Skeen ASAP.

The question came up as to whether or not there actually *is* a Policy Council still at work at the College. They have not met in approximately two years, though business concerning changes in Policies and Procedures has still been ongoing. Academic Council has followed appropriate governance procedures, but it's not clear how (or if) Policy Council is providing feedback on Policies and Procedures—and is thus an active component of Shared Governance—at the College.

Judy also informed the group about a new “Chair’s Council” she’d heard referred to on multiple occasions in recent weeks. Tywan explained this group is so the chairs can make collective decisions when a specific chair has a scenario where they need to make a decision, and can get a collective opinion from all the chairs, thus avoiding making decisions within the vacuum of a single department. (This topic came up as a side note during the discussion about the current status of the Shared Governance Policy Council.)

FOLLOWUP: Academic Council Co-Chairs are encouraged to email Sarah Skeen so there is a strong voice to ensure the uncertainty of the faculty contract has been (or will be) considered before finalizing Policy and Procedure language on CC+.

6) Meet the Candidate – Dean for HHS (see October 26 Update) – (Judy A.)

Tywan asked the group to appear for the meet the candidate forum, and ask the prospects for the Dean’s position about where they stand about CC+ and other current issues at the college. He also stated there are two candidates moved forward by the hiring committee (Dr. Penny Smith and Dr. Curt Laird). Bios on the candidates are available on the college website.

7) New Academic Council committee call for nominations and election: Diversity and Inclusion; election for other Academic Council committees (Judy A.)

Judy created a solicitation for nominations to run for election this Autumn 2017 because this committee needs to be formed as soon as possible, and will need to meet as soon as the elections are complete. The details of the general focus of this committee is summarized in the document Judy created, but to summarize: the purpose of this committee will be to address issues related to diversity and inclusion that fall within the academic realm of the College.

FOLLOW UP: Judy will run the document about the Diversity and Inclusion committee to be sent to faculty by Jack Cooley before sending it out, then send out a call for nominations and conduct the election.

8) Faculty safety issues in and out of classroom: Procedure 7-10G –Student Code of Conduct, Classroom Safety Committee (MOU Current Faculty Contract), College Safety Council (CSCC website) (Judy A.)

In response to recent—and ongoing—problems with students (and in a few cases, other employees including faculty) behavioral issues that create safety concerns, and confusion and uncertainty about the process faculty should follow in these cases, Judy presented the issue to Academic Council for discussion.

Rachael Romain explained how the College had afforded some additional protection in a case where an instructor had been fired, and appeared on campus in a harassing manner. The college ultimately moved the class locations for her, for the remainder of the term, but did not publish the new locations in the college schedule/website. Only she and the students were aware of the new classroom locations.

Other Academic Council members described particular instances when they have had an issue with a potentially dangerous student and the experience(s) they had with the BIT and campus police. There is a general concern among the group that the BIT and/or campus authorities may not be doing enough to remove a student from a course or the campus when they behave in a threatening or dangerous manner. Several members also indicated they believe the college and faculty and students would benefit from a more deliberate course of action regarding a student who has an effect on classroom dynamics because of threatening or harmful behavior.

BIT procedures may very well be in place, but faculty need to be better informed about what they should do to report incidents, etc. Holy Finnegan pointed out the resources on the college's website where faculty can read about what they should do, but with the new website launching this coming weekend, they may or may not be found in the same place(s).

Cathy shared the general response any faculty/employee should do whenever they have a concern: (1) Call the CSCC Police, (2) fill out the online incident report form, and (3) report the incident to your chairperson. What the college did here to protect the faculty member is something all faculty should know and be able to request such action at any time a student or terminated employee poses a threat and attempts to track them down on campus.

FOLLOW UP: Judy asked Academic Council members to see if any of their committee members were on the Campus Safety Council or other relevant committees so Academic Council can have a links with committees that address these safety issues.

Meeting adjourned at 11:53 A.M.

Submitted by,

Adam Keller, CSEA Vice President