



COMMUNITY  
COLLEGE  
OF RHODE ISLAND

## Governance Council Committee Meetings Agenda / Minutes

<b>Academic Advisory Committee</b>	
<b>Date of Agenda Posting:</b>	<b>November 24, 2017</b>
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>Friday, December 1, 2017</b>
<b>Meeting Start Time:</b>	<b>2:00 PM</b>
<b>Meeting Actual Start Time:</b>	<b>2:05 PM</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>Room 1040, KN</b>
<b>Meeting Secretary:</b>	<b>Lauren Nagel</b>

### 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	√	
Steven Murray	CCRI FA President	√	
Ann Omollo	CHEM	√	
Robert Pezzillo	OFTD	√	
Duayne Rieger	PHYS		
Jody Robinson	ENGR		
John Rood	Nursing	√	
Melissa Sullivan	DHYG	√	

David Vito	BIOL		
JoAnn Warren	BUSN		
<b>Others Attending</b>	Students from Student Gov. (Knight)		
	Students from Student Newspaper (Both arriving during Agenda item "Other")		

### Academic Advisory Committee Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Approve minutes of last meeting: November 3, 2017.
3. Updates:
  - ACC Website
  - Committee Member Terms
4. WP, WF, NA Policy Changes
  - Linda Gatewood, Catherine Johnson, and Paula Marcello
    - WP, WF, NA Policy Proposal – Updated (Nov. 15, 2017)
  - Ray Kilduff – Student Affairs on new “W” proposal
5. Other

### Agenda

<b>Agenda Item 1</b>	<b>Notes on Discussion</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Welcome &amp; ACC Website updates</b></li> </ul>	Ray Kilduff, welcomes everyone – discusses problems with the accuracy of the AAC member list. Apologizes to those affected by the inaccuracy, in particular, John Rood & Kate Dunnigan. Ray spoke with Kevin Salisbury, who agreed to update the list next week and remove the second site of meeting minutes during the intercession.
<b>Agenda Item 2</b>	<b>Notes on Discussion</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Approval of minutes</b></li> </ul>	The November 3, 2017, minutes were reviewed. No Corrections were made. Minutes were approved.

	Kay, Catherine Johnson motioned to approve. Steve Murray seconded. o Against, Ann Omollo abstained.
<b>Agenda Item 3</b>	<b>Notes on Discussion</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Updates</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Committee Member Terms</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Ray Kilduff begins discussion asking if everyone on the committee had been appointed. It is discussed that most people present had been appointed by the Chair of their department. Steve Murray was not appointed but has automatic involvement with his position as CCRIFA President. Student Representative, Christian DeLaCruz, was nominated by Student Government to represent all CCRI students.</p> <p>The current problem with 2 year terms on this committee is the turnover happens all at once. A suggestion was made to choose names out of a hat to find out which Department Chairs will have to appoint new members or reappointed present members. This would effectively stagger term years.</p> <p>Paula Marcello asks if there is a 2-year max to serving on the Committee. Ray Kilduff answers that there is not a max, chairs can choose to reappoint the same faculty members repeatedly.</p>
<b>Agenda Item 4</b>	<b>Notes on Discussion</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>WP, WF, NA Policy Changes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ WP, WF, NA Policy Proposal – Updated (Nov. 15, 2017)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Ray Kilduff moves on to next agenda item – WP, WF, NA Policy and mentions that there is hope that we will have a motion today regarding it and asks the sub-committee for an update.</p> <p>Paula Marcello notes that there was a change made in the policy proposal regarding extenuating circumstances after the withdrawal period. Faculty will now have the ability to assign F, W, I or IC (math) grades after the 13<sup>th</sup> week of class.</p> <p>Kay (Catherine) Johnson continues discussing the update - “As stated on 2<sup>nd</sup> page, #2 “After week 13, faculty may assign a grade of W due to a student’s failure to complete the course”. Previously Faculty did not have this option. The bottom line is that we gave faculty a lot</p>

of latitude in assigning grades, we didn't want to force assigning one grade over another.

It was then brought up that some word changes might be necessary on Page 2 under #2. Current statement says "The student SHOULD contact the instructor to request this grade. Students SHOULD not assume that failure to complete the course will result in automatic withdrawal from a course." Change the first SHOULD to advised to and the second SHOULD to must not so the statement now reads: "The student IS ADVISED TO contact the instructor to request this grade. Students MUST NOT assume that failure to complete the course will result in automatic withdrawal from a course." Using the new wording allows faculty some freedom to grade based on completed work.

On Page 3 of the Policy manual, updates have been made to offer suggestions of statements to provide in instructor Syllabi discussing the policy changes and the process for students to follow.

Steve Murray suggests changing language in the syllabus statements. The current statement reads "Faculty WILL UPDATE syllabi and faculty websites which include the CCRI grading system to reflect THIS policy." Steve suggests removing "will update", as it makes the action mandatory.

Christian DeLaCruz asks "Is there an appeal policy? Students need to have the option to appeal."

Kay responds, "Yes but students should contact the instructor."

Ray then responds: "Grievance process does not change once enacting this policy. There is a huge benefit to this update to the policy, since students will now have 13 weeks to Withdraw and receive a 'W', which is approximately 85% of the class." Current policy in my department has caused problems and this proposal fixes those problems. Regarding withdrawal online, it doesn't matter what the students do, current policy still requires faculty withdrawing students anyway. The new policy now makes it their responsibility which is where it should be. There is also an unintended consequence –

students are dodging the final to receive a 'WF' instead of an 'F'. The current policy encourages students to dodge.

Kate Dunnigan mentions to Christian that it is important for students to familiarize themselves with the handbook, and when necessary, the Dean can get involved in certain situations.

Christian responds that many students don't read the manual.

Ray Kilduff notes that "...it is their responsibility to do so".

Kate then suggests an FAQ or card be created for each student when they start at the school – to get information to students who don't know about the policies and procedures.

Ray mentions to Christian that faculty don't know about extenuating circumstances in students' lives unless students contact faculty to let them know.

Christian questions the meaning behind #3 on Page 1, which reads "to facilitate student accountability regarding management of classes they register for".

Ray responds that they are saying that the responsibility is up to the student. By rule, faculty have no choices in grading currently and students know how to work the system, this statement tightens up accountability on the students' part. Many students are simply not officially withdrawing because they know that faculty will withdraw them anyway. Worse, some students who have passing grades, don't withdraw because they prefer a WP to a W because they note it looks better on the transcript.

Christine Fox makes a motion to approve the policy and amendments.

Ann Omollo seconds.

Approve? Unanimous vote.

○ Student Affairs on new “W” proposal

Ray Kilduff notes that Tracy Karasinski is currently not here, but she had asked that we make Cathy Tessier aware of the changes. Ray explains that he did meet with Cathy and she had no problem with the proposal. However, she did note that on the backend they might keep ‘WF’ – to mean withdrawal by faculty. Only they would see it on the back end to show how the withdrawal had occurred. On the transcript it would simply show as a ‘W’.

Paula then suggested using ‘FW’ instead of ‘WF’ to avoid confusion. Ray explained that Cathy wanted to use the WF on the back end because the element already existed in the system – they would just change its meaning.

Ray explains that the next step from here is for the amendment will go to Rosemary – Ray will make a meeting with the VP. Then it will go to the President’s Council meeting. The earliest this policy will go into effect is Fall 2018.

Ray also explains that currently if students have not participated at all they receive an NA, No Assessment. If they’ve completed 1 assignment they receive a WP/WF. With the new policy, student can withdraw over a 13 week period instead of 10 and there is no difference between “W”s – grading decision is in same place as A-F.

Christian says that he is just making it all the way through the policy and is unsure if he is able to withdraw his vote.

Ray Kilduff responds that he didn't think Christian could withdraw his vote now but then asks Steve Murray for his opinion regarding Robert’s Rules. Steve then says to Christian, “I don’t think you can withdraw, but I encourage you to still voice your concern at President’s Council.

Christian explains that he is not too familiar with the policy, he hadn’t read it prior to committee meeting.

Paula responds “This committee has worked a long time to make this policy fair.”

	<p>Kate adds “The policy, to be clear has passed and is moving on.”</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item 5</b></p>	<p><b>Notes on Discussion</b></p>
<p>○ Other</p>	<p>Ray begins to discuss his concerns regarding the “incomplete policy”. In the handbook it reads well but it has never been implemented fully. If a student fails to complete their work and the faculty member does not change the grade, then that student’s grade should automatically change to an “F” per the policy approved in 2012. The grade is still being changed to a “WF” when they should be turning to an F. According to Kathy Tessier, IT has not made the change, despite the policy being approved by the President’s Council.</p> <p>Mark Hartshorn then asks “Would they have to make retroactive changes on that?”</p> <p>Ray responds “I don’t know, but I will get more information”.</p> <p>Steve moves on to a concern regarding the <u>Academic Assessment Policy</u>, which should not be seen by another committee – we never voted on it and it was tabled. It went forward and was approved. This sort of thing makes the process meaningless.</p> <p>Ray responds to Steve’s concern by explaining that a few days before the meeting Jeanne McColl was told by Doug Flor that the approval should go through Academic Advisory Committee, Ray disagreed but we made room for it. Our committee makes policy regarding academic standards, so I allowed it.</p> <p>Steve then questions “What’s the rush?” It is then explained that they needed the approval for a NEASC report that is due in February. Steve adds that the committee was in the process of voting and he had concerns that will now not be addressed.</p>

Ray then relays that Jeanne had explained it would come to the Committee for comments – never for voting.

Kate Dunnigan then asks “Which committee approved it?” Ray responds “Academic Programs Review” Kate asks if they are in governance.

Kate also comments saying that there is a problem with what governance is supposed to do. No one is in agreement on the issue – we must insist on parallel and equal information on each issue.

Mark Hartshorn then asks “Do they post minutes?”

Steve comments that they want the veneer of we’ve done what we’re supposed to.

Kate responds that with an advisory system such as ours makes it difficult. A hybrid governance system makes it confusing. People need to sit down and discuss who does what.

Melissa Sullivan asks “What does John mean by support departments on page 3 of the meeting minutes.” John Rood responds that certain departments are considered support departments if they are provide support for programs but do not have programs themselves.

\*\*Students begin to file into the room and start video recording the meeting\*\*

Kathryn Blessing asks “Are people allowed to record?”

Student responds “Yes”.

Ray Kilduff asks Steve Murray for his opinion regarding video recording in this context. Steve responds that he thinks it is fine.

Ray Kilduff then turns to the approximately 20 students who have filled the room and says “It’s Ok, you can continue recording.

A student (Lex) responds – “I wasn’t asking for your permission either way”.

Ray Kilduff then recognizes Student Government President, Charles Meserve. Charles notes that he is very familiar with “Robert’s Rules” and he states Christian has a right to withdraw his vote and we can not prevent him from doing so.

Ray Kilduff points out that he does not know if that is, in fact, true we will check Robert’s Rules, and if it is true, we will make it right.

Charles Meserve and several students state they will not leave until Christian is allowed to withdraw his vote.

Ray Kilduff then pointed out that this policy was considered and revised repeatedly over the last three years, and the latest update was discussed extensively at the last meeting. Your representative was not here at the last meeting and failed to read the materials. He came unprepared for the meeting but did ask questions and voted for approval. Only after we went on to the next agenda item, did he asked to change his vote.

Steve adds that he believes Robert’s rules do not allow a vote change after the vote has been completed. Then adds that students are free to go to further meetings to voice their concerns.

Many students begin talking/yelling saying that they are in opposition to getting rid of WP/WF/NA.

Kay Johnson then asks how they can be in opposition of it if without knowing what is in the new policy.

Christian is recognized and noted that “This took place because I tried to withdraw my vote. He tend texted Student Government during our meeting to tell them so.

Ray Kilduff– Everyone here has a voice, but it doesn’t mean that you “WIN” I voted against “WF” previously. I lost. That’s how it works. This is a fair democratic process.

Paula Marcello– You can still get a “W” after 13 weeks – making it fair. After 13 weeks you need to speak to your instructor.

	<p>Kay Johnson– You can still “grieve” against misinformed instructors or rulebreakers.</p> <p>Steve Murray after checking Robert’s Rules explains to students that: “Yes, a member has the right to change his or her vote until the result is announced. After the result is announced, however, the member can change his or her vote only by permission of the assembly. Permission can be granted by general consent or by motion to grant permission which needs a second, is undebatable, and takes a majority vote to adopt. Thus, you can change vote only by permission of the Committee.”</p> <p>That did not happen but “I will move now to allow Christian to withdraw his vote” Seconded by Ray Kilduff.</p> <p>Unanimous vote to allow removal of vote. Seconded by Steve Murray</p>
<b>Agenda Item 6</b>	<b>Notes on Discussion</b>
	<p>Kate Dunnigan made motion to adjourn, Melissa Sullivan seconded. Meeting adjourned @3:47 pm</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Lauren Nagel</p>