



COMMUNITY
COLLEGE
OF RHODE ISLAND

Governance Council Committee Meetings Agenda / Minutes

Academic Advisory Committee	
Date of Agenda Posting:	November 3, 2017
Meeting Date:	Friday, November 3, 2017
Meeting Start Time:	2:00 PM
Meeting Actual Start Time:	2:03 PM
Meeting Location:	President's Conference Room, KN
Meeting Secretary:	Lauren Nagel

Member Attendance

Committee Member Name	Title	Present	Notes
Joseph Amante y Zapata	Performing Arts	√	
Kathryn Blessing	Library	√	
Barbara Bradley	NURS		
Susan Brown	Foreign Language/ Culture		
John Cole	Dean Arts, Humanities, Soc. Science	√	
Elizabeth DaCosta	MATH	√	
Christian DelaCruz	Student Rep		
Kate Dunnigan	Social Sciences	√	
Christine Fox	English	√	
Linda Gatewood	RHAB	√	
Mark Hartshorn	ART		
David Igliazzi	CJLS		
Catherine Johnson	COMI	√	
Madalena Josephs	Allied Health		
Tracy Karasinski	Student Services	√	
Ray Kilduff	Committee Chair	√	
Lisa Mallozzi	Student Services	√	
Paula Marcello	HMNS	√	
Jeanne McColl	NURS	√	
Steven Murray	CCRI FA President	√	
Ann Omollo	CHEM		
Robert Pezzillo	OFTD		
Duayne Rieger	PHYS		
Jody Robinson	ENGR		
Melissa Sullivan	DHYG		

David Vito	BIOL		
JoAnn Warren	BUSN	√	
Others Attending			
Doug Flor	Director of Assessment	√	
Kim Rouillier	Rehab Health	√	

Academic Advisory Committee Agenda

1. Approve minutes of last meeting: April 21, 2017.
2. Academic Assessment Policy
3. WP/WF Policy Update
4. Term Limits
5. Minutes/Online Committee List
6. As may arise

Agenda

Agenda Item 1	Notes on Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome, approval of minutes 	<p>The April 21, 2017, minutes were reviewed. Corrections were made. Minutes were approved as amended</p> <p>Steve Murray motioned to approve. John Cole seconded. o Against, Kate Dunnigan abstained.</p>
Agenda Item 2	Notes on Discussion
	<p>Ray Kilduff introduced Jeanne McColl, Doug Flor, & Kim Rouillier to discuss Academic Assessment Policy.</p> <p>Jeanne McColl explained that NEASC is requiring program reviews in 2019. The review process will identify something within the program that needs improvement. NEASC is not specifying how to evaluate or benchmark, which allows for differences based on programs. NEASC requires that the process be put online, and include the previous 3 years.</p> <p>Kim Rouillier then explained that there is also a requirement to report on the effectiveness of courses.</p>

Using the Academic Program Review on “Sharepoint” would allow for information to be saved, and would only require updates to information each year. The “Sharepoint” program would allow for printed reports as well as reports to share online.

Steve Murray asked, “Why is this coming to our Committee? Who told you to come here for approval? What is our power on this committee?”

Ray Kilduff explained that this committee is here to focus on academic standards - committee members, faculty, and other governance committees can bring “standards proposals” for review. This proposal changes standards so it deserves our comments.

John Cole asks how support departments are supposed to operate.

Jeanne McColl & Kim Roullier respond that they were trying not to be too specific to allow for differences in departments and personal preferences. Down the line the Policy makers would need to meet with each of the support departments to make adjustments.

In response, John Cole mentions that it worries him that the policy will never be effective if there isn’t a specific process.

Kim then points out that in the past the college has tried “One-size fits all” approaches that have not been effective.

John Cole then mentions that perhaps each department should be required to submit their own plan based on what works for their department.

Doug then explains that NEASC doesn’t say how you have to assess, just do it and demonstrate continuous improvement.

Catherine (Kay) Johnson asks about the name of the policy, thinks that “Academic Assessment Policy” is misleading. Suggests using “Academic Program Assessment Policy” instead.

	<p>Ray Kilduff pointed out that the policy template was not followed when the draft was submitted, and the committee would feel uncomfortable moving this forward without the proper format. Ray thanked Kim, Jeanne, and Doug for their presentation and requested that they come back in the future (December 1st) with the policy in the proper form.</p>
--	---

<p>Agenda Item 3</p>	<p>Notes on Discussion</p>
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

	<p>Ray Kilduff introduced Paula Marcello, Linda Gatewood, and Catherine (Kay) Johnson to discuss the WP/WF/ NA abolishment proposal. Asked them to highlight changes since last update of the proposal.</p> <p>Paula Marcello explains that through the proposal, they are requesting that WP/WF/NA grade options be removed and be replaced by W or go to Faculty to receive WEC (Withdraw Extenuating Circumstances). Changes in W grade includes allowing an Official Withdraw through Week 13, giving students a lot of time to make the decision to Withdraw or not. Also gives Faculty the option to give a true grade if they do not officially withdraw themselves, which doesn't necessarily mean they will receive a failing grade – grade will be based on work completed in their time attending the course. Faculty also have the option to give an IC for students with extenuating circumstances.</p> <p>Steve Murray asks if when including the WEC option, no appealing is allowed. For example, “The decision made by instructor is final and not appealable in any way.”</p> <p>In addition, Ray Kilduff suggests that instructors should be able to make the decision of what grade to give their students based on the information available to them.</p> <p>JoAnn Warren then asks if such a statement would interfere with the Academic Appeals Committee. After discussion, it was decided it would not interfere.</p> <p>Elizabeth DaCosta then questions the need for WEC, in cases of extenuating circumstances, why not just give an IC to a student.</p>
--	---

Steve Murray then suggests a wording change in the draft of the policy, on Page 2 under the “CCRI grading system revision”, the sentence currently reads “Should a student stop attending class without officially withdrawing, faculty will assign a grade of ‘zero’ for uncompleted work . . .” Steve suggests changing the word will to can. Making this change will remove the need for WEC.

JoAnn Warren suggests using Administrative Withdrawals instead.

Paula mentions that using an administrative withdrawal would require chairs involvement and take away faculty ability to make decisions without being overseen or approved by chairs.

Discussion then went on to include differences between types of Withdrawals. Administrative would include registrar withdrawals; Student withdrawals would be allowed through Week 13; Faculty withdrawals would be an instructor’s choice if students don’t withdraw themselves. Faculty could choose to give a grade based on work completed instead of a withdrawal, in the case that students don’t withdraw themselves.

It was suggested to use “W” for all types of withdrawals as is done at Valencia Community College. After discussion, all agreed, no one opposed.

Ray Kilduff and Kay Johnson then noted the importance of informing students of the new policy. Kay suggested that each instructor include their withdrawal policy in their syllabus. Ray explained that this would be a significant change and Departments should have their own opportunity to decide what grade the student receives, giving the Faculty the power to choose how to grade NA, WP, and WF situations.

Ray also mentions that the limits of faculty withdrawal would need to be decided, as consequences would need to be dealt with if suddenly everyone started giving “F” grades, instead of NA, WP, or WFs. Ray Kilduff pointed out in Fall 2016, there were over 3800 NA, WP, WF

	<p>grades that would turn into Fs which would then affect financial aid and drop outs. That needs to be considered.</p> <p>Linda Gatewood explains that initially the change might be messy, until students realize the change, but it would be up to each instructors/departments discretion.</p> <p>John Cole added that this kind of policy change puts the grade choice at the instructor’s discretion, whereas they are currently obliged to give “WP” or “WF”. Kay added that this policy change is a compromise for those who want to give “W” or “F”.</p> <p>Regarding the new withdrawal policy, Ray suggested putting together a sample statement for instructors to put in their syllabi might be helpful. In addition, he asked that everyone go back to their departments and get feedback from faculty and staff members.</p> <p>Traci Karasinski then added that it would be a good idea to check with Cathy Tessier to see if there would still be enough information on the back end to check where the withdrawal had come from. Something to distinguish whether it was a student withdrawal or a faculty withdrawal, it would be a matter of coding it within the system. Ray Kilduff agreed that he would talk to Cathy.</p> <p>Linda Gatewood agreed to add discussed changes to the WP/WF/NA policy and resubmit for the Committee’s consideration.</p>
Agenda Item 4	Notes on Discussion
	<p>Ray Kilduff brought up that there is a problem with the Term Limits of this Committee. Currently, everyone is given a two-year term and start and finish at the same time, meaning every 2 years the entire Committee is completely new people. Ray suggests that the appointments be changed so there is continuity within the Committee.</p> <p>Traci Karasinski mentions that in another Committee they had the same problem. Their solution was to go through who was appointed and who was elected. From there, decide who stays for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, in order to create a better flow.</p>

	<p>Next, the Committee discussed who was appointed vs. elected and many people were unsure.</p> <p>John Cole explained that there is a flaw in governance that forces people to leave, even if they are interested in staying. People should be able to continue on the Committee if they are interested. John Cole also noted that for this committee chairs appoint faculty.</p> <p>Ray Kilduff asked that everyone go from the meeting and find out whether they were appointed or elected and this would be put on the agenda for the next meeting.</p>
Agenda Item 5	Notes on Discussion
	<p>Ray Kilduff mentioned that there are 2 different sites with minutes on the school's website, one of which is complete while the other is incomplete. This is just a matter of getting the incomplete website taken down. In addition, the Committee List is not being updated. That needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Ray Kilduff will get more information and will provide an update at the next meeting.</p>
Agenda Item 6	Notes on Discussion
	<p>Suggestion for next meeting: Friday, December 1, 2017 from 2-3:30 pm</p> <p>1 person out of 15 unable to attend. Date chosen.</p> <p>Traci Karasinski made motion to adjourn, Catherine Johnson seconded. Meeting adjourned @3:20 pm</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Lauren Nagel</p>