



2015-2016 COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE  
 MINUTES OF September 24, 2015  
 Highland Lakes Campus

The College Academic Senate was called to order at 3:18 p.m. by Chair Shawn Dry. He welcomed everyone to the first CAS meeting of the 2015-16 academic year. The following individuals were present:

- |                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Auburn Hills:<br>Guests:             | S. Dry, J. Farrah, K. Sigler, E. Stotts<br>D. Bayer, M. Goldin, J. Peart, M. Robinson, J. Shadko, P. Shipp-May  |
| District Office Guests:              | C. Maze   |
| Highland Lakes:<br><br>Guests:       | R. Bragg, V. Emanoil, E. McAllister, T. Pryor, P. Ravikumar, K. Schulte, K. Stilianos<br>P. Anderson, C. Aretha, D. Baker, N. Barkell, M. Compton, J. Forbes, T. Garcia, B. Garnsey, C. Genei, J. Helminski, N. Kassab, J. Lobert, G. Mandas, A. McFadden-Keesling, J. McKay, M. Miles, C. Roman, S. Snyder, L. Stark, M. Ston, N. Wong |
| Orchard Ridge:<br><br>Guests:        | T. Baracco, A. Jackson, J. Mitchell, D. North, C. NyKamp, N. Valenti<br>D. Edford, G. Faye, V. McNiff, P. Schade, B. Stanbrough, H. Tanaka  |
| Royal Oak/Southfield:<br><br>Guests: | S. Charlesbois-Nordan, V. Lamb, M. May, C. McKinney, S. Schmidt<br>C. Carbone, T. Hendricks, M. K. Lawless, J. Matteson, M. Thomas  |

- 2) Acceptance of Agenda:  
**MOTION: To accept the agenda as written. Seconded, passed.**
  
- 3) Approval of Minutes: (Note: Approved minutes are posted to the Academic Senate’s Infomart site)  
**MOTION: To approve the minutes of June 25, 2015 as written. Seconded, passed.**

4) Leadership Report: (Note: Senate Leadership Report is posted on Infomart)

- ACCESS Evening Hours
  - Campuses expressed concern last year that ACCESS-assisted testing was not available in the evening hours.
  - Academic Dean Mary Ann Sheble was consulted. She met with the ACCESS coordinators last week and determined the following procedures:
    - ACCESS hours of operation: 8:30am-5:00pm, M-F.
    - After-hours testing: Unless a student needs specific assistive technology or the presence of an accommodation provider for testing that would prohibit the use of the ASCs, the ACCESS Offices work with the ASCs to arrange for after-hours testing. ASC evening and Saturday hours are posted on the ASC website.
    - Testing with assistive technology and accommodation providers: Arrangements are made with the student and instructor for testing during regular business hours.
    - After-hours equipment check-out: Instructors should contact the ACCESS Offices to make arrangements to pick-up equipment at the campus ASC or Library.
    - Discussion followed:
      - OR – The ENG discipline has concern with literacy courses; many students need to use the ACCESS office during evening hours for testing and the test needs to be done concurrently.
      - AH – A lot of ACCESS students work during the day and the only time they are on campus is between the hours of 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.
      - Nursing students are required to make-up a test if they miss it; it is impossible for them to retake the test during 8:30 – 5:00 p.m.; early morning ACCESS hours are needed for these students to retake tests.
      - The college is not servicing our students by making this change at the time they need to be serviced.
      - Why couldn't we do creative scheduling?
      - We should get a legal opinion on this regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act.
      - What is the percentage of students that attend class in the evenings?
  - Shawn Dry asked the Senate to address further comments or suggestions with Dean Sheble.

**ACTION: The Campus Senates were asked to discuss this topic at their October Campus Senate meetings and create a set of recommendations/motion to move forward.**

- Tuition Policy
  - The Board of Trustees has begun to discuss its philosophy behind setting tuition and fees.
    - September 10 Special Meeting: minutes available on Board Infomart site
    - September 15 Regular Meeting: motion to accept the first reading of tuition policy values failed; a copy of Board Agenda Item 6.2 – Tuition Policy (first reading) is posted on Infomart.
  - Thus far the conversation has been entirely based on financial considerations. Should the Senate wish to provide insight on tuition policy from an academic and student success perspective now would be the time for us to have these conversations.

- Discussion followed:
  - There hasn't been a discussion of the Federal Government's role in paying for tuition.
  - The College needs to have a better sense of students that attend OCC outside Oakland County.

**ACTION: The Campus Senates were asked to review the proposed tuition policy values at their October Campus Senate meetings.**

- Enrollment Decline
  - Campuses discussed the enrollment decline documents provided by the administration and came up with requests for additional information:
    - Recruitment efforts: to be addressed in Vice Chancellor Jackie Shadko's presentation
    - Mathematical correlation between rising unemployment and rising enrollment: to be provided by Vice Chancellor Cathey Maze
    - Impact on enrollment of the application deadline: to be provided by Vice Chancellor Maze
    - Business plan to increase enrollment through workforce development: to be provided by Vice Chancellor Maze
  - The Senate can take up this issue again once the additional information has been provided.

#### 5) Presentation

- Recruitment Taskforce
 

Jackie Shadko, Vice Chancellor for Student Services gave a PowerPoint presentation on "Recruitment Task Force." She highlighted the current state of recruitment at OCC as follows:

  - Silos:
    - Student Services
    - Academic Affairs
    - Marketing & Communications
    - Institutional Research/Institutional Effectiveness
  - Recruitment Task Force Subcommittees: ( Administrative "White Paper" – one of the studies reviewed)
    - Pre-Enrollment Pipeline
    - International Recruiting
  - December Report with Recommendations On:
    - Tools & Techniques
    - Target Marketing
    - Outreach
    - The On-Campus Experience
  - Myth #1: The Task Force is fixing the 13% decrease in Enrollment. – No, we are looking at the tools and techniques of recruitment and will make recommendations in that arena.

- Myth #2: The Task Force is premature before college priorities are clarified. – No, we are focused on tools and techniques so as to be ready to take targeted action – marketing and recruitment – once they are clarified.
- Myth #3: We don't care about our K-12 partners. – No, the new style of recruiting brings students to campus, not the reverse. As we transition we have volunteers attending some college fairs.
- Thank you for your time! – Further updates on recruitment will be provided once more information is gathered.

Questions/Answers:

- All school districts have been informed of the transition the College is going through and they have been informed of how to get in touch with us.
- It is a “new world” contacting students through social media and websites instead of face-to-face.
- Was there a significant drop in enrollment at peer institutions? The drops vary across the board; IR is looking into this.
- Student demographics are carefully examined by experts; raw data regarding demographics will be part of the December report.
- A recommendation was made to explore more partnerships with 4-year institutions; if a pathway can be defined for students, this can be heavily marketed.
- How can we volunteer for college fairs? Deb Bayer should be contacted for technical programs; Carla Sims should be contacted for non-technical programs.
- Participation in the task forces' are open to all and recommendations are appreciated.

6) New Business

- Online Courses and Programs

Cathey Maze reported that this week she visited all the campuses and provided an update on distance education. Only 30 credits (multiple sections) will be offered online starting winter 2016 and continuing until approval is received from the HLC to offer an online program; criteria used – looked at the highest enrolled online general education courses and picked the top five. Faculty scheduled to teach online winter are going through training developed by IT and they will need to complete their training and review/revise their sections by the end of October.

Kayla LeBlanc was hired to be the Dean of Distance Education. She has been teaching online courses for 17 years and has worked with the faculty for 10 years. She will be working with implementation teams on standards (based on best practices) for online classes; the “look” of all online courses have to be the same. Courses will also be reviewed for FERPA and ADA compliance.

She highlighted other information as follows:

- By the end of September, students will be able to buy their books online using their financial aid.
- Counselors and the ASC's have piloted “ZOOM”, and “Class Climate” will be used for online student evaluations.
- OCC needs to determine which pilot program (1) we want to offer online and get approval from the HLC; Senate will have input regarding this process.
- Discussion followed:
  - Definitions of hybrid and online courses: hybrid courses replace 10-74% of face-to-face work with online work; online courses replace 75% or more of face-to-

- face work with online work. This definition was created by faculty and staff on EMP objective team 12; a new action plan will be posted to the EMP site soon.
- Hybrid courses will have to go through the same review process as online.
  - Augmented courses are not high on the priority list right now.

**ACTION: The Campus Senates were asked to start conversations regarding the selection of offering a pilot program online and developing criteria for selecting the order of offering new online courses.**

- **ENG 1510 Placement**  
Shawn Dry reported that the Senate passed a motion recommending that for the purposes of academic integrity, all courses should have an ENG 1510 placement requirement by fall 2016. The “List of Course Alternatives for ENG 1055 Students – Effective Fall Semester 2014” that was approved by Senate was presented; it was noted that ENG 1060 placement is working but all the prerequisites had to be manually entered.

**ACTION: The CAS Chair asked the disciplines and programs to start having these conversations and include the following:**

- **Work on creating an exemption list for students who place into ENG 1060 (i.e., who fall-short of the ENG 1510 placement requirement). This list needs to be completed and voted on by the Senate by the end of February 2016.**
  - **Recommendations: avoid college-level transfer courses, GE courses that transfer on MTA, and courses that are required for transfer degrees and programs.**
  - **ENG 1060 includes reading comprehension as well as writing components and this should be considered when adding courses to the exemption list.**
  - **Shawn Dry will ask the ENG discipline to provide a list of the different skill-levels achieved at those levels of placement; this information will be provided for Discipline Day.**
- **Proposed Academic Objectives**  
Cathey Maze provided an overview of the three “Proposed Academic Objectives” listed on the back of the agenda. Proposed Academic Objective #1 and #3 are straight forward. Chancellor’s Cabinet is considering changing the admission requirement to require a high school diploma, GED or homeschooling (baseline) – Proposed Academic Objective #2 – “Ability to Benefit.” OCC is a college (post-secondary institution); giving students the opportunity to fail is not doing them justice. Students that haven’t completed one of the three requirements listed above are not eligible for financial aid unless the college administers an ability to benefit test which we do not want to undertake at this time. However, we want to give students information about alternative paths if they don’t meet our admissions requirement.

Discussion followed:

- Are other community colleges moving in the same direction?
- Students that applied late have a tendency to fail and drop out; this topic is being addressed by other community colleges as well.
- Retention has increased since the college implemented an admissions deadline.

**ACTION: The Campus Senates were asked to have a conversation regarding the proposed objectives and provide feedback at their October Campus Senate meetings.**

7) Standing Committees/Chairs

▪ *Academic Planning/ M. K. Thomas*

Mary Thomas reported the following:

- For the 2015-16 academic year, the committee is exploring a different approach to Academic Planning as follows:
  - Master calendar of EMP Committee Meeting dates
  - APC Committee will shift focus on questions and expect follow-up in meetings
- Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 16<sup>th</sup> from 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. in the DO Board Room. If interested in joining the committee, please e-mail mkthomas.

▪ *Curriculum and Instruction/ M. K. Lawless*

Mary Kay Lawless reported the following:

- The Curriculum Committee held its annual “Kick-Off” meeting on September 14, 2015.
- The CIC updated the following curriculum forms over the summer and these forms will be posted on Infomart under the CIC site once they’ve been reviewed by Senate. The forms were created to make the CIC process easier for faculty bringing through new curriculum, or revising an existing course. Mary Kay Lawless and Ken Sigler highlighted the changes made to the forms:
  - Curriculum Proposal Checklist
  - Course Proposal Form
  - Program/Degree Proposal Form
  - Ballot College Curriculum
  - General Education Outcome Information
  - Michigan Transfer Agreement Inclusion Application

**MOTION: To approve the six curriculum forms as presented above. Seconded, passed.**

▪ *Curriculum Review/ P. Schade*

Peter Schade reported that CRC held their first meeting on September 4<sup>th</sup>. He provided the following update:

- A chart was provided that included the Review Name, Review Status, and Lead Reviewer for the 12 program/discipline reviews for 2015-2016; Automobile Servicing is the only review “pending.”
- He met with the lead coordinators and they are reviewing data to return their first draft.
- Topics from the September meeting:
  - Minimum voting standards
  - Real-time document sharing
- Upcoming topics:
  - CRC will discuss alternatives to the letters for feedback sent to lead reviewers
  - Discuss ideas for improving communication between disciplines and programs

- Improve link between assessment and review during the review process
- CRC's next meeting will be held on October 2<sup>nd</sup>.
- *Student Outcomes Assessment/ C. McKinney*  
Carlespie McKinney reported the following:
  - The committee reviewed/discussed the General Education outcomes of 10 universities and one community college and compared them to OCC's; they plan to examine another dozen or so including more community colleges. Initial finding – we have 9 – 10 GE outcomes; most colleges only have 3 GE outcomes and a few have 5.
  - The committee agreed to discuss/examine, in detail, an alternate taxonomy as the first step in possibly moving away from Bloom's.
  - Cheryl Aretha announced that Rachael Lathrop is the new Director of Student Learning Assessment.
- *Technology Management/ J. Matteson*  
Judy Matteson reported the following:
  - On Friday, January 29, 2016 a conference will be held regarding ADA compliance and accessibility; more details to follow.

#### 8) Ad Hoc Committees/Chairs

- *Grade Appeal Process/ K. Tiell*  
Shawn Dry reported that the Campus Senates reviewed the revised report -“Suggested Grade Appeal Process (June 2015 Draft)” and suggested changes which the committee incorporated; the final version and a flowchart are posted on Infomart -“Suggested Grade Appeal Process” (September 2015 Draft) and “Student Grade Appeal Process Flow Chart.” The only change to the process is as follows: “Student has 60 (increased number of days) business days from the start of the next semester (excluding the start of Summer II which shall be deferred to the fall semester) to submit Grade Appeal Material to instructor.” A “Student Grade Appeal Process Flow Chart” is also included that explains the process in a step-by-step format. Note: 60 business days will be added to flow chart.

Discussion followed:

- If resolution is not achieved, student proceeds to the next step.
- Campus deans and presidents have been removed from the process.
- The academic dean of the discipline is included in the process.
- There is no longer a student review board.
- Students had 6 months to submit grade appeal material to the instructor under the previous process.
- Students can have an advocate; however, the practice of the advocate has been that they can attend grade appeal hearings but they are not allowed to speak during the appeal process.
- Students need to be provided due process.

**MOTION: To send the revised Grade Appeal Process back to the committee to add language regarding student advocacy. Seconded, passed.**

- *MTA – Business/ T. Hendricks*  
Tom Hendricks reported that Business is going through the CRC process; MTA compliance will be addressed in the review and the outcomes will be included in the action plan.
- *MTA – Liberal Arts/*  
Shawn Dry reported that the Liberal Arts ad hoc committee will be meeting tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. in the Board Room; there are 28 volunteers and others are welcome to attend.
- *MTA – Science/ D. Edford*  
Dawn Edford reported that the Associate of Science Review Committee has completed a proposal to align the Science degree with the MTA. The committee presented the proposal and copies have been posted on Infomart; any questions regarding the proposal should be sent to Dawn Edford.

**ACTION: The Campus Senates were asked to review the MTA - Science report at their October Campus Senate meetings.**

Shawn Dry reported that after the MTA reports are reviewed by the Senate, the procedure will have to go through the curriculum process.

- 9) Administration/C. Maze & T. Sherwood
- None

- 10) Community Comments
- None

- 11) Adjournment:  
Meeting adjourned: 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Vincent Lamb, Secretary

---

Nancy K. Szabo, Recording Secretary