CALL TO ORDER
Ms. Moore called the meeting to session at 2:05pm.

ATTENDEES
Present: Mary-Rita Moore, Dr. Michael Flaherty, Donna Stadermann, Pat Zinga, Baylee Cabrera, Pamela Perry, Maria Correa, Chuck Bohleke, Sam Tolia, William Justiz, Andrea Blaylock, Kevin Kennedy, Tom Olson

Absent: Humberto Espino, Kay Frey

Others Present: Michael Garrity, Lauren Kosrow, Dr. Debbie Baness-King, Dr. Quincy Martin, Marilyn Craig, Lara Taylor, Dr. Douglas Olson, Corey Williams, Cheryl Antonich, Sandra Berryhill

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The Minutes of the February 22, 2016 meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

HOT TOPICS
-None-

OPERATIONAL ASSEMBLY
Mary-Rita Moore announced that Shelley Tiwari was unable to attend this Council meeting and that a written report on the Operational Assembly meeting would be sent over the list serv within the week.

ACADEMIC SENATE
Dr. Michael Flaherty informed the Council that the Academic & Scholastic Standards Committee is looking for various clarifications regarding the final exam schedule, and this discussion took up quite a bit of time at the Academic Senate meeting. It is important to be sure that the new exam schedule doesn’t lose any hours. Often times, having the final exam at a different time than the regularly scheduled class is usually a huge problem for students. The Vice President, Doug Olson, did express that he would like the new schedule be in place by Fall semester, and Julie Gilbert is planning on making a formal presentation to the Senate in upcoming months. The Student Development Committee has been working with low cost textbooks, a current trend among higher education institutions. The Academic Support Committee reported on their committee meeting, at which Dr. Debbie Baness-King was the guest and the discussion was focused on working on the best solution for faculty and student needs and what resources are available for the tutoring center, which is currently facing some changes. The Campus Quality Committee has been working with Kevin Kennedy and Mike Garrity on room assignments, to see what improvements can be made to faculty room assignments. The Technical Advisory & Distance Learning Committee is continuing to work on online certification for faculty which would give faculty another option for getting certified if they would like to teach online. This certification is required by the faculty contract. The committee is looking at different models, as they want this certification to be equivalent to the faculty members who go off campus for the ION training, which is still an option. Finally, Dr. Flaherty stated that he sent out the committee assessment guidelines and template that were proposed by the Council’s subcommittee and there were no
questions or concerns. He added that Bob Greenwald requested a non-PDF template form, so they can work directly off that form, and asked Pamela Perry if this was possible. Ms. Perry stated that the Microsoft Word file was available for download on the Council’s web page, but she would also be sure to send that out to the committee chairs as well.

OLD BUSINESS

ASSESSMENT OF BUSINESS PRACTICES AND POLICIES

Mr. Kennedy informed the Council that significant progress had been made in the past few weeks, including the establishment of a contract with Docusign which will allow for electronic signatures on business forms. The first form that will be utilizing the Docusign software is the budget transfer form, which has three uses: the budget transfer, an expense reimbursement, and creating a new grant account. The committee has decided to break those separate uses down into three separate forms, in an effort to be more efficient and less confusing. The committee has been meeting once a month and as they continue to move forward they will also be working with the President’s Cabinet to ensure that these forms are efficient and user-friendly for all employees. Mr. Kennedy also added that there will also be training offered for the use of Docusign.

SHARED GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE ASSESSMENTS GUIDELINES

Pamela Perry announced that the assessment booklet and the assessment template in Microsoft Word are available on the Council webpage with the FY 16 goals. In addition, last year’s assessment has been posted and each year following will be posted on the web page as well. Ms. Perry added that some committees requested a specific deadline for which assessments should be completed. She asked the Council for feedback on whether we should offer a deadline and what that date should be. Dr. Flaherty stated that he informed the Senate committees that he wanted the assessments before the leave for summer break and felt that was adequate for those committees and perhaps the Council could use that as a deadline for remaining committees as well. It was decided that the deadline would be one week after final grades are due and that date is May 27, 2016.

COLLEGE COUNCIL ANNUAL SURVEY REVIEW

Ms. Perry thanked the Council for sending out the second reminder on completing the College Council Annual Survey, as the survey now shows 249 responses. The biggest jump was in the Classified employee group with 35 additional responses, followed by Adjunct and Mid-Manager employee groups which each had 17 additional responses. She added that every single area received additional responses so that second reminder really did make a difference. She added that the survey will be open for the remainder of the week. Ms. Perry also stated that part of the Council’s assessment was the questionnaire to the committee chairs. She informed the Council that this questionnaire was distributed last year but received very low participation so she wanted to ask the Council if perhaps they should be strategic on when they distribute this questionnaire to optimize participation. She asked within the next month, when would be the best time to distribute and how long should they give the chairs to complete the questionnaire. Dr. Flaherty responded that two weeks of time to complete the questionnaire should be adequate. Ms. Perry stated that since there were questions in the questionnaire on the assessment guidelines that were just posted on the web, perhaps they should give time to process those guidelines, and suggested early to mid-April for distribution. Ms. Moore asked if
the group thought people would be looking at assessment guidelines prior to when the actual assessments were going to be due, since the deadline for assessments was just set at May 27th. Ms. Perry stated that hopefully they would have looked at them prior to discussing at the meetings, and worries that if they wait to complete the questionnaire until after the assessments have been turned in, the response rate will be low again. The goal is to use the feedback during the Council retreat in July, and also perhaps the committee chairs will seek input from the committees when they meet for the last time. It was decided that mid-April would be ideal for distribution of the committee chair questionnaire.

NEW BUSINESS

CLASSROOM SCHEDULING AND SWIPE STATIONS
Michael Garrity announced that he had been made aware of some concerns regarding the R25 scheduling platform (College Net) and there seem to be some misconceptions that he would like to clarify. The College Net platform is not related to the Colleague change over that occurred a couple years ago, and actually goes back 7 years, back when the campus was still using RALPH. It was decided to use the College Net platform to better utilize spaces, as the campus was experiencing a shortage of classrooms due to smaller classes being placed in rooms that could accommodate much larger class sizes. College Net didn't get fully implemented until the campus was operating on Colleague, but the switch had begun several years prior. Another misconception was that College Net randomly selects spaces for classes, which is not true. Colleague passes course section information to College Net, along with date, time and seat capacity. It does not pass instructor information, so R25 is not available of who is teaching the classes when it selects the rooms. Each section, by department, is given preferences. Each department has a primary building preference and the platform will go through and assign department sections in the primary building preference first, if there are no available rooms it will go to a second building preference which is typically the building next door, if that doesn't work there is a third preference. If neither of those three buildings have space available, then R25 will go through and search the remainder of the campus. The platform will go through and do the entire list of sections – which currently is about 1600 sections for approximately 130 rooms on campus - and then, before officially assigning the rooms, R25 then prints a list of suggested room assignments. The scheduling office staff then go through and manually reviews this output to ensure that the rooms fit course specifications. Finally, there are the exceptions of sections who weren't placed in any rooms by the platform, and so the scheduling office manually selects rooms for those courses. At the time that this optimization is run, instructors have not yet been assigned to the individual sections, so once again, the system has no way of knowing which instructor is being assigned to which room. Once the optimization is run, which is done as early as possible, if courses are added later then obviously there is a harder time getting in the primary preferred building. However, what happens at the start of each semester, sections are dropped for various reasons, at which point faculty can contact the scheduling office with a request to have their section moved to a new location that may be better for their schedule. The scheduling staff is very open to helping faculty find new space, if space have been opened up due to the cancellation of other sections. Mr. Garrity stated that he has been informed that faculty have reported being very satisfied with the assistance they have received from the scheduling office. He also mentioned that he and his team would be open to reviewing the primary and secondary preferred department buildings, if faculty felt that the preferences listed on the R25 platform weren’t accurate. Lara Taylor asked if the system takes into consideration equipment or technology when assigning classrooms. Mr. Garrity responded yes, and that some classrooms with specific equipment, aren’t even
assigned by the system and have to be assigned manually. Other classroom with technologies such as smart boards, are assigned according to listed class specifications. Marilyn Craig asked how that information would be conveyed to the system, and Mr. Garrity stated that the department chair would include this information when the course section was created, and the department chair is able to make specific requests for courses. Dr. Flaherty stated that he very much supported the information that Mr. Garrity has presented, especially in regards to the willingness of the scheduling office staff to assist with any specific needs or concerns. He went on to state that the afternoon and evening course are fairly easy to identify room space because enrollment for those course times is generally low, but everyone should keep in mind that with morning classes there is a pretty full schedule between 9am - 1pm. The scheduling office will be willing to look diligently but during those prime hours it is extremely hard to switch room locations. Dr. Flaherty indicated that locations are matched as best as possible and that a speech class would never be assigned to the cadaver lab. Ms. Taylor and Ms. Craig responded that they were aware of incidents in which art classes were assigned to cadaver labs or chemistry labs and Dr. Flaherty stated that should not be happening and that may have been an extreme case in which the options were either using that location or cancelling the class. Pat Zinga asked Mr. Garrity if they’ve been able to identify the primary reasons why the inconvenient assignments have been made. She wondered if it was typically that a late add-on class had been created or if the preferred building locations need to be tweaked, or if a trend had been identified as to what was causing the inconvenient room assignments. Mr. Garrity responded that his team is just beginning to get into understanding what reports the system is capable of generating for analytical purposes. He added that it does seem that the courses that are added later do seem to be the most prominent cause of inconvenience but that he hopes to have more analytics on that soon. Dr. Chuck Bohleke stated that he and the other academic deans have been looking at this problem for some time, and specifically looking at how courses with different credit hours and late start classes affect room assignments, in hopes to identify different ways to better manipulate room occupancy and efficiencies.

In regards to swipe stations, Mr. Garrity responded to formerly suggested recommendation from Marilyn Craig to uses Canon copiers for adjunct swipe cards use. He stated that the two systems were not compatible and the Canon readers are unable to support adjunct time cards. He did state that they are working on adding additional swipe stations, and that they are up to 10 swipe stations as of this semester. Buildings G, E, J and A have all had swipe stations added this year. Mr. Garrity added that his team will continue to work with Mr. Justiz on making sure any high-use area for adjunct faculty have swipe stations, in order to further accommodate this need.

ADJUNCT FACULTY WORK SPACE
Dr. Douglas Olson responded to the recommendation submitted by Marilyn Craig regarding adjunct faculty work space and stated that he and his staff have been exploring adjunct hubs on campus and do acknowledge that additional hubs are needed. They have been identifying spaces, particularly on the east side of campus, where new hubs can be created for adjuncts and those should be coming forth in the new future. He also clarified that while the language in the recommendation included the term “base” for buildings with adjunct worse space, that was not a term or concept used by administration, and that the don’t refer to adjunct faculty as having one particular base building or workspace. He added that they have identified the CTE as being a functional hub space where adjunct can go and work, print resources and meet with students, as long as there aren’t any events going on. Ms. Craig asked if she would be able to use an adjunct office in the D building if she was teaching a course in that
building. Dr. Olson clarified the difference between adjunct offices and adjunct hubs, stating that offices operate under their discretion and are available for the faculty that are stationed there primarily. Hubs are for any adjuncts to use. Ms. Craig and Ms. Taylor asked where they could find the hub locations, stating they have never seen a list. Dr. Olson responded that there are two in the H Building, for the line buildings, the CTE can be used, there will be one in the T building but the room number needs to confirmed. Ms. Moore confirmed that there would be a promotion of these hub locations as well as a list posted on the employee portal, recognizing that there is more administration can do to make those hubs easily accessible. Dr. Flaherty and Mr. Justiz both added that the understood the hesitancy of allowing adjuncts or faculty members in specific offices, as these offices are accountable for office supplies and office management and supervision. It would be difficult to remain organized and well managed if the office was open to any faculty or adjunct at any time.

STUDENT AFFAIRS ASSESSMENT
Ms. Moore introduced this next agenda item, reminding the Council of their several conversations on the importance of assessment and indicating that in the recently held Assessment Day, Student Affairs gave a presentation on the work they are doing with assessment. Dr. Deborah Baness-King and Lauren Kosrow brought that presentation to the Council (see attached; Appendix A).

Ms. Zinga informed the Council that she had received a call from the financial aid office at Oakton College wanting additional information on the student affair team’s assessment process. Ms. Moore stated that is important information for the Council to hear and know. She also asked if the student affairs assessment progress on the portal is open to the college community, and Dr. King confirmed that it was. Ms. Moore stated that this is something that they would like to promote this work to the campus and create other opportunities for dialogue and feedback. Dr. King and Ms. Kosrow expressed that the entire team has done an amazing amount of work and they are very proud of the responsibility and work that each member of the team has shared in equally. Ms. Perry asked how this work has been received by the various student affairs departmental areas. Dr. King responded that the reporting goes all the way down to the employees that are actually doing the work and she is confident that every employee in student affairs is aware of the assessment plan and their process. Ms. Moore asked what the Council can do to support this effort. Dr. King responded that allowing them to continue to speak and present on various aspects of the process, in addition to being receptive to data and outcomes that may inform decisions that the Council needs to make. Dr. Martin added that helping to spread the word and promote the work that the team is doing in order to support collaboration and dialogue across campus.

NEXT MEETING

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 3:16pm.