

Oakland Community College

2010-2011 COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES OF January 27, 2011
Royal Oak Campus

The College Academic Senate was called to order at 3:20 p.m. by Chair Mary Ann McGee. The following individuals were present:

Auburn Hills:	R. Andersen, C. Decker, S. Dry, B. Konopka, J. Mousty, A. Palmer, K. Tiell
Guests:	S. Flynn, G. Foster, T. Khan, N. Showers
District Office:	L. Nadlicki, M. Schmidt, N. Szabo, T. Meyer
Guests:	R. Holcomb, B. Montgomery, M. A. Sheble
Highland Lakes:	V. Emanoil, J. Helminski, S. Henke
Guests:	N. Boulos
Orchard Ridge:	T. Baracco, M. Kokoszka, M. A. McGee, L. Roberts, D. Strand, J. Shadko
Guests:	T. Ingram, D. Haria, D. Johnson
Royal Oak/Southfield:	E. Abbey, T. Hendricks, S. Jackson, R. Lamb, C. Neely, J. Parent, B. Sadecki, B. Stanbrough, S. Reif
Guests:	S. Charlesbois, L. Crews, R. Elshaer, G. Fournier, S. Grunfeld, J. Jensen, D. Johnson-Bignotti, M. K. Lawless, K. Lee, D. Mathews, J. Matteson, D. McRoberts, G. Moore, G. Nasari, D. Niemer, H. Othman, M. Shelton-Beatty, N. Shockley, N. VanDeGrift

- Acceptance of Agenda:

MOTION: To change the order of the agenda – “Administration” will go before “Old Business.” Seconded, passed.

3) Approval of Minutes:

MOTION: To approve the minutes of December 9, 2010 as written. Seconded, passed.

4) Leadership:

- Chair Mary Ann McGee reported that the motion passed at last month's Senate meeting regarding ENG coursework has been approved by the Chancellor and now the challenge to implement begins. The disciplines will be asked to review their coursework to determine any exemptions. The Curriculum Committee will also be asked to devise an expedited curriculum process for approving the exemptions. The implementation date is targeted for the 2012-13 catalog.

Mary Ann McGee also reported that all the redesign recommendations have been received from CASC and SSSRT and these groups have finished their work. The next phase is public comment and review.

5) Presentation

- "Benchmarking Update – NCCBP"

Mary Ann McGee introduced Zheng Wang who will be making a presentation on "Benchmarking at OCC – NCCBP Results 2008 & 2010." Zheng Wang gave a PowerPoint presentation on the topic and highlighted the following key findings:

- How this started
 - Dr. Benjamin Young, Chair of OCC HLC asked the OCC Steering committee: "Who are your peers and whom do you aspire to be like?"
- Benchmarking – "Benchmarking is the practice of comparing quantitative indicators of inputs, outputs, and outcomes that are system elements used by an organization for its internal processes."
- Why is benchmarking important?
- NCCBP (National Community College Benchmarking Project)
- NCCBP Benchmarks
 - Developmental student success in first college-level courses
 - Distance learning outcomes
 - (Note: Only 2 benchmarks are listed above and 25 were provided in the report)
- 2010 NCCBP Colleges – National Community College Benchmarking Project in 2010, 268 community colleges participated:
 - Institution Type: Multi-campus (28.7%)
 - Campus Environment: Primarily Suburban (36.9%)
 - Calendar: Semester (94.4%)
 - Faculty Unionized: Yes (48.1%)
- NCCBP – OCC Peer Groups
 - Selection criteria
 - 17 peer colleges in 2008
 - 24 peer colleges in 2010
- NCCBP – A Glimpse of OCC Results (only a section of the report was provided)
- NCCBP – 2010 OCC Key Findings – OCC score below 2010 NCCBP 10th Percentile

- NCCBP – 2010 OCC Key Findings – OCC score above 2010 NCCBP 75th Percentile
- NCCBP – OCC Key Findings (2008 vs. 2010) – Measures with notable changes from 2008 to 2010
- The Use of NCCBP Data
 - Key Performance Indicators
 - Technology Management Committee
 - Senate Leadership
- Next Steps
 - Participate annually
 - Use results to identify best practices
 - Develop strategies to integrate results into College’s routine research studies
(Note: only 2 items were listed out of 5 in the report)
- Thank you for your time!
- Questions and Answers
- For more information about OCC’s NCCBP results, please go to IR’s website – http://infomart.oaklandcc.edu/IR/Reports/NCCBP/NCCBP_OCC_MeasurSummary2008and2010_rev1.10.11.pdf, or e-mail Zheng Wang to request a copy of the presentation.

6) Administration

- Chancellor Meyer addressed the Senate by indicating that the presentation was a nice way to start into the next conversation. There have been questions about the redesign process – where do we go from here, and how do we fit into the future? There were three redesign efforts: CASC, SSSRT and Academic Programs. The recommendations have been reported by CASC and SSSRT. The Academic Redesign Teams will be reporting their program recommendations to CASSC in March. CPC has met and discussed how to handle the information and recommendations; and they are going to align and prioritize the recommendations as they relate to the Strategic Plan. The redesign recommendations will also be coming to the Senate for comment and review. Next fiscal year is a year of transition. The changes being recommended now will be reflected in the 2012-13 budget and we need to move expeditiously. We can’t do anything about the down turn in the economy but the entire college can work together to move forward into the future.

7) Old Business:

- Allocation of Tutoring Resources

MOTION: To remove Motion #1 re: Allocation of Tutoring Resources from the table. Seconded, passed.

Eric Abbey reread motion #1 that was lodged for discussion by the Campus Senates at the December CAS meeting:

MOTION #1: To set up a process wherein every academic discipline that has, or expresses, interest in tutoring is consulted before decisions are made regarding budgets and services.

Eric Abbey presented the following motion from RO/SF Campus as a substitute motion for Motion #1:

MOTION: That the allocation of tutoring resources to campuses be based on SCHs and to suggest having more transparency at the college level. Seconded.

Friendly Amendment: To strike “be based on SCHs and to suggest” from the motion, and replace the word having with “have.” Seconded.

The motion as amended passed.

MOTION: To remove Motion #2 re: Allocation of Tutoring Resources from the table. Seconded, passed.

Eric Abbey reread motion #2 that was lodged for discussion by the Campus Senates at the December CAS meeting:

MOTION #2: That the Southeast campus is opposed to charging fees to students for tutoring. Seconded.

Discussion Followed:

- What type of fees? The spirit of the motion is opposed to charging all tutoring fees.
- Is the motion meant to do anything other than express a dislike of fees?
- If we start charging usage fees, we are going to limit access for many students.
- We need to encourage openness for students that need academic support.
- Senate can make recommendations but it isn't an appropriate action for Senate to act on.
- The tutoring motions from RO/SF came out of the charge from the Chancellor.
- The Chancellor indicated that he asked Senate to recommend considerations on how to address tutoring. Is there a responsible way to deliver tutoring consistently across the college?
- A motion was passed at the December CAS meeting that recommends that the ASC rather than the Senate address the specific issues mentioned in Dr. Meyer's charge.

Friendly Amendment: That tutoring services remain accessible to all students. Seconded, passed.

- Computer/Technology Competency Requirement

Shawn Dry highlighted information on the handout entitled, “Auburn Hills Campus Senate Technology Competency Motions.”

MOTION: To remove the revised motion with clarification re: Computer/Technology Competency Requirement from the table. Seconded, passed.

Shawn Dry reread the motion that was lodged for discussion by the Campus Senates at the December CAS meeting:

MOTION: The AH campus moves that the college establish a computer and technology literacy requirement (or assessment) for all students that obtain a degree at OCC.

Discussion Followed:

- AH Campus is concerned that students are underprepared technologically and they are also leaving OCC in the same status.
- How does this intersect with literacy outcomes that are already in place?
- What kind of technology are we referring to?
- There used to be an outcome that dealt with technological literacy. When the outcomes were revised it was changed to information literacy which involves a use of technology.
- Information literacy, according to the instructors who teach it, is about “research” (finding information).
- How many students is this trying to address?
- High schools now have a technology requirement.
- If technology skills are an important part of your course, it should be clarified in the catalog.
- First we need to focus on students not being able to read and write.
- A recommendation was made that a subcommittee be created to address this issue.
- Computer literacy may be different from campus to campus.
- This may be a campus-based problem instead of college-wide.
- This would create more barriers for students.
- The purpose of the motion was to start a discussion on the topic at the campuses.

MOTION: To withdraw the above motion. Seconded, passed.

MOTION: To refer the work to TMC to consider a minimal computer competency that will support student success. Seconded, passed.

TMC is willing to take on this task. Shawn Dry will send additional information to TMC.

- Motion Tabled at December CAS Meeting re: Defining College-level Course Work

MOTION: To remove the motion re: Defining College-level Course Work from the table. Seconded, passed.

Mary Ann McGee reread the motion that was lodged for discussion by the Campus Senates at the December CAS meeting:

MOTION: College-level course work be defined as all courses that are not part of the developmental course list. Seconded.

Mary Ann McGee reminded Senate that a student doesn't have to complete ENG 1510 – only have a placement level of ENG 1510 to register for a college-level course. In order to provide clarification, she also provided a list of “Currently Active Developmental Courses.” Any course not on the “developmental list” is considered “college-level

coursework.” Disciplines will be asked to review their coursework and determine what literacy level of placement a student needs in order to take their class. Currently, the courses listed on the developmental list are the only classes a student can take if they have not placed into ENG 1510. Disciplines will have a chance to add to this list, and the Curriculum Committee will be asked to come up with an expedited process for disciplines to do this.

The motion passed.

8) New Business:

- Motions from Curriculum Committee

Mary Kay Lawless presented the following motions on behalf of the College Curriculum Committee:

MOTION: The College Curriculum Committee requests that the Registrar’s office be responsible for ensuring that the content of the online catalog be compared to the printed catalog and to make corrections as necessary. Seconded.

Discussion followed:

- Someone needs to review the two versions of the catalog to make sure they are accurate.
- There are a lot of differences between the online version of the catalog and the printed one.
- Some courses are no longer in the catalog and they are listed online.

The motion passed.

MOTION: The College Curriculum Committee requests that the Registrar’s office investigate whether or not Datatel can assign one course number per subject to be used for any number of special topics course in that area. Also, that the title on the section of the course, once created, be changed to specify the particular topic being used so it will appear on the transcript as such. In addition, the system should be changed to not treat these courses as a repeat, giving credit for each time a different special topic course is taken for a particular subject, possibly limiting the number of “Special Topics” credits a student can take. Seconded.

Currently, there is a problem with the numbering system for “special topics” courses and this is a more reasonable approach to correct the problem.

The motion passed.

9) Standing Committees:

- *Academic Master Plan/Shawn Dry*

Shawn Dry reported the following:

- The committee is excited to begin the process of reviewing the Strategic Plan and Academic Plans to see how the different committees are using this information.

- He encouraged all present at the meeting to get involved in their Campus Academic Planning Committees.
 - More information regarding the campus academic groups is available from the Campus Presidents or you can contact Shawn Dry.
- *Curriculum/Mary Kay Lawless*
Mary Kay Lawless presented the Consent Agenda:

MOTION: To accept the Consent Agenda. Seconded, passed.

Mary Kay Lawless reported that the College Curriculum Committee is meeting every Monday at DO at 3:00 p.m. in the Board Room. Deadlines for guaranteed inclusion in the 2011 catalog are as follows:

- College Curriculum Meeting – March 7, 2011
 - Approval by College Academic Senate – March 24, 2011
- *Curriculum Review Committee /Karen Lee*
Karen Lee reported that the Curriculum Review Committee is scheduled to meet on February 4th from 9:00 a.m. – noon at DO.
 - *Student Outcomes Assessment/Leslie Roberts*
A report from SOAC was available on the distribution table. Leslie Roberts highlighted the following:
 - SOAC began discussion of a faculty proposal to expand the focus of Faculty Assessment Day(s) to include afternoon session that focus on using results of past and on-going Gen Ed outcomes and discipline-specific assessment to improve teaching and learning. More details will be provided after the February SOAC meeting.
 - *TMC/Judy Matteson*
Judy Matteson provided the following updates:
 - Faculty Showcase will be held on April 1, 2011 from 9:00 a.m. to noon at the SF Campus.
 - A Newsletter will be out soon! Watch for it.
 - eReaders at TLTCs

CMS Subcommittee:

- 36 members of team
- Top 4 choices are: Desire 2 Learn; Moodle; Sakai; Blackboard
- Next
 - Fine tune the evaluation rubric for the RFP
 - Ask all faculty/staff for their “stories”
 - What systems have you used?
 - Your story....your likes....your dislikes

10) Ad Hoc Committees:

- *General Education Outcomes/*
Marilynn Kokoszka reported the following:

- SOAC and Gen Ed are piloting an assessment process and a follow-up report will be provided to Senate.
- The committee is also working on three proposals to integrate outcomes into the distribution list.
- The committee has a lot of work to complete.

12) Community Comments:

- New faculty, student representatives, and student observers attending a Senate meeting for their very first time were introduced.

13) Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned: 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilynn F. Kokoszka, Secretary

Nancy K. Szabo, Recording Secretary

COLLEGE CURRICULUM / INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE
Academic Senate Consent Agenda
January 27, 2011
Royal Oak Campus

MINOR PROGRAM REVISIONS

1. **MGT.CMP.AAS Construction Management Professional.** Change program description. This change will clarify who is eligible for the block of 22 transfer credits. Target date for first offering is Fall 2011.

MAJOR PROGRAM REVISIONS (10-Day Notice Sent)

1. **MGT.CMN.AAS Management Development – Construction Management Option.** Change program description. Increase the number of required credits from 64 to 78, making it an extended degree program, thus changing the program code to “**MGT.CMN.AASX**”. Add the following courses to the list of Major Requirements: CMN-1250 (3-cr), CMN-2100 (3-cr), CMN-2300 (3-cr), CMN-2400 (3-cr). Changes to Required Supportive Courses: Remove BUS-2530 (3-cr) and add CHE-1000 (4-cr) or PHY-1610 (4-cr). Target date for first offering is Fall 2011.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **MOTION:** The College Curriculum Committee requests that the Registrar's office investigate whether or not Datatel can assign one course number per subject to be used for any number of special topics course in that area, and that the title on the section of the course, once created, be changed to specify the particular topic being used so it will appear on the transcript as such. In addition, can the system be changed to not treat these courses as a repeat, giving credit for each time a different special topic course is taken for a particular subject, possibly limiting the number of “Special Topics” credits a student can take.
2. **MOTION:** The College Curriculum Committee requests that the Registrar's office be responsible for ensuring that the content of the online catalog be compared to the printed catalog and to make corrections as necessary.