

Prince George's Community College
Academic Council Meeting
December 11, 2008; 3:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
CAT 133

Members/Alternates Present: Angela Anderson, Shannon Fleishman, Mike Gavin, Carolyn Hoffman, Fatina Lamar-Taylor, Ed McLaughlin, Nick Plants, Barbara Sanders, Scott Sinex, Charles Thomas, Sherry Kinslow (for A. Mickelson), J. Rosicky (for R. Barshay and R. Spells), Nick Plants

Others Present: Eldon Baldwin, Mara Doss, June Fordham, Betty Habershon, Tia Roebuck, Verna Teasdale

Absent: Mark Hubley

The meeting was called to order by S. Dunnington at 3:00 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

Agenda was approved as circulated.

Approval of November 13th Minutes

The November 13th minutes have not yet been edited; they will be approved at the next Council meeting.

Information/Discussion Items

Designating Service Learning Courses – B. Habershon (M. Doss)

Betty Haberson, Coordinator of the Service Learning Program, discussed service learning initiatives with the Council. She clarified that Service Learning can be incorporated into courses, activities within courses, and/or related programs (e.g. Collegian Centers and Hillman Entrepreneurs). Service Learning activities tie community service to academic assignments in a unique way (i.e., through reflection). A number of activities have been described as service learning, but many have not been developed in association with, or coordinated through, the Service Learning Office. The Service Learning Office would like to begin identifying all academic activities designated “service learning”. When a database is developed, the next step will be to ensure that all designated activities truly meet generally accepted standards for service learning.

Therefore, B. Habershon requested proposing a requirement to notifying the Service Learning Office of any planned service learning or volunteer/community engagement activities within the Academic Area.

This requirement would support identifying partners and activities, maintaining a database and reporting Volunteer/Community Engagement activities within the Academic Area of the college. It would also allow the Service Learning Office to identify and if possible provide any additional support for the proposed activity.

Action:

Council members unanimously approved this project.

B. Habershon will move forward to develop a mechanism for collecting the necessary information. She will also check with Madeline Yates on whether there's also information that could be collected that would be beneficial to the Maryland Campus Compact initiative.

Academic Standings (continued discussion) – B. Sanders

Attached is a corrected version of the Revision of Academic Standing Policy Summary that was previously discussed in the special meeting held on December 2nd. During the special meeting, it was decided that the minimum GPA standards for academic standing should be raised and matched to those of Financial Aid. Therefore, the only change to the summary reflects Financial Aid's correction of the last category under Total Credits Attempted from 44 to 45 or above.

V. Bagley addressed capabilities/limitations of the existing **Colleague** software:

- Can't manage CEUs
- Can count credits and calculate GPA
- Could calculate a QPA (incorporating all credits, including Developmental) to determine academic standing
- Can determine what student needs to do to be released from academic warning
- Capable of customized programming but additional funding would be required in order to handle reprogramming
- Can calculate academic standing only if some type of credits are involved

It was suggested that the Council take a look at what other Datatel community colleges are using. It was clarified, however, that most Datatel schools are using some form of credits. The Council members were referred to a handout from the December 2nd meeting containing information from other Datatel schools.

B. Sanders mentioned a dialogue with the student member of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Academic Standing who reported that her high school's International Baccalaureate (IB) program used a separate QPA and GPA and that the concept would probably already be familiar to students. The biggest hurdle would be labeling both "GPA". The question is how this would be implemented, what a transcript would look like and how the process would be explained in the catalog. This process is not unlike the one used by area community colleges using Datatel.

It was suggested again that the QPA could only be shown and dealt with internally. MHEC's requirement is that credit not be awarded for a course that is not considered college-level material.

It was pointed out that **the 6th item on the Summary** is extremely problematic as it creates an academic standing category that is treated in two different ways depending on

whether it is the student's first or subsequent time in that status. Council members discussed at length whether or not students should remain in the restricted category for a second semester.

It was questioned whether there is a way for Colleague to notify students of their options (those who are facing academic warning or dismissal). Currently, students receive a letter. It is, however, possible for colleague to notify students.

The consensus of the Council's opinions on the following Summary items was:

- Item 2 – Assign some type of appropriate “credit” to Developmental courses.
- Item 3 – Yes there should be 2 separate grade averages for Developmental and College-level courses
- Item 4 – Yes, with appropriate changes in terminology, **if** changes can be supported by Colleague and are not in conflict with MHEC policies.
- Item 5 – Okay to leave as is
- Item 6 – No, students would be restricted for only one semester.
- Item 7 – Yes

S. Dunnington and B. Sanders will consult with M. Taibi and V. Bagley to clarify what can be supported by Colleague and will then edit the current Academic Standing Policy and submit Code revisions to the Board of Trustees.

Council won't move forward with a final recommendation to the Board with this until it is clear that any final decisions can be programmed in Colleague.

S. Dunnington will clarify with Dr. Dukes what degree of specificity she wants to go into the Code. It is possible that we can request far less specificity allowing for changes to be made more readily.

V. Bagley will email Datatel schools tomorrow to request screenshots of what students would see relative to QPA and GPA, and what transcripts would look like if we use both QPA and GPA.

General Education – N. Plants and M. Gavin

- **Approving Courses for GenEd Designation for Spring 2009**
 - M. Gavin was able to match PGCC's core learning outcomes to *most* of the outcomes in the statewide ICAO document reviewed at the November 13th meeting. This process will facilitate the review of the five courses submitted in fall 2008.

Action:

N. Plants will set up a GenEd Committee meeting as soon as faculty members return in January. S. Dunnington will attend the meeting and will assist with the approval process as well as discuss the upcoming work that the Gen Ed Committee needs to address.

- **Completing Core Learning Outcomes**
 - Members discussed how to complete the revisions and approval of the CLOs. The GenEd Committee started the process so they could be charged to complete the analysis of faculty feedback and making any necessary changes. N. Plants questioned whether this activity, the gen ed course approvals, or the gen ed program revision should take priority.
 - Although it was suggested that any revisions of the CLOs be deferred until a complete gen ed revision is completed, it was agreed that this is not a desirable course of action, as it would negate the processes and feedback from faculty.
 - S. Dunnington pointed out that data from College Enrichment Day should be submitted to a content analysis and the results used to make any changes in the proposed wording. One or two individuals should be able to complete this task and bring the results back to the Council for review.
 - When the CLOs are approved, an assessment committee will have to determine how the outcomes will be assessed.

Action:

C. Hoffman agreed to do a content analysis on the faculty feedback and bring the results to the next Council meeting. M. Gavin agreed to work with C. Hoffman to finalize any recommendations. T. Roebuck will send an electronic version of the Core Learning wording suggestions to M. Gavin and C. Hoffman. Results of the content analysis will be brought to the January 15th Council meeting.

- **Establishing a Revised GenEd Program**
 - Following the discussion about the ICAO standards for gen ed courses (see November 13th minutes) it is evident that the Prince George's Community College gen ed program must be revised to be more rigorous, with interrelated courses and some assurance that the courses are helping students gain designated skill sets. For example, if we expect students to be critical thinkers, then critical thinking activities and learning opportunities, using common language and expectations, must be woven through all GenEd courses.
 - N. Plants stated that the lack of a philosophy of education and a corresponding philosophy of general education will impede any efforts at developing an interconnected gen ed program.
 - Although we want students to gain specific skills, Maryland prescribes a gen ed program as being comprised of certain numbers and types of courses. Therefore a new gen ed program must address this disconnect.

- N. Plants identified suggested priorities for the gen ed revision (see handouts). He also pointed out that the recent revisions made by Montgomery College may serve as a useful guide.
- Several members questioned whether there are certain gen ed courses that students should take first/immediately to prepare them for the rest of their coursework.

Action:

Council members agreed that the GenEd Committee should begin its work by drafting a college-wide philosophy of education. The committee was also asked to plot out a time line for completing the total program revision, with the understanding that the college catalog deadline is in mid-February.

Structuring the Travel Study Approval Process – J. Rosicky

J. Rosicky distributed a draft plan on the structure of travel study courses. It was pointed out that some area colleges rely completely on a committee. Council members were asked to recommend whether there should be a group (e.g. a travel study committee) to handle all proposals and serve as a clearinghouse, or one person who would serve as a coordinator. Another alternative offered was having the Deans and Chairs deal with travel study course by course.

On a separate, but related, topic, the status of an MOU that would allow students at one community college to register through their home school for travel study programs at another community college was discussed. This initiative is a product of the Maryland Community College International Education Consortium (MCCIEC). As a part of the agreement, each member school agrees to have a web page for travel study opportunities, including procedures. The MOU has been approved by the BOT and is awaiting Dr. Duke's signature.

Action

Council unanimously agreed on 1 person (travel studies coordinator) with a committee to assist (advisory group) in reviewing and approving travel study proposals.

Final Thoughts on Welcome Back Week

A. Mickelson will distribute the schedule containing times and room information to all faculty and staff in Academic Affairs.

The guest speaker, Dr. Mark Milliron, has been asked to address topics related to assessment, student engagement, and retention in his lecture/speech. He is also willing to meet with groups throughout the day prior to his presentation. Council members discussed what groups might most benefit from meeting Dr. Milliron to discuss current issues. The Council recommended groups involved with assessment and/or reorganization. The Area presentation from Dr. Milliron will likely take place in Queen Anne in order to accommodate other college employees joining the session.

Reports

S. Dunnington updated Council members on her presentation to the CWF on the Council's progress. She gave a PowerPoint presentation which included a preview of the Council's webpage. The response was overwhelmingly positive to the amount of action Council has taken thus far.

S. Dunnington also met with the Chairs Council in the past week to discuss leave time for January 20th. Faculty who do not attend the Academic Affairs Area meeting will be charged 4 hours of leave.

Questions and Answers

Open Discussion – Q&A

A. Anderson announced that Technology Support Services recently announced that scantron sheets are no longer supported by their budget so this now must come out of division/departmental budgets. This change has taken effect already. S. Dunnington will investigate further; however, if any divisions need additional funding to support these purchases, they should let J. Fordham know.

Setting Next Meeting Agenda

It was agreed that the Council will meet on January 15th from 10 a.m. to 12 noon.

Agenda items will include:

- Updates on Welcome Back Week
- Academic Standing
- Update of Course Approvals by GenEd Committee
- Update on CLOs

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Tia Roebuck, Recorder