

Prince George's Community College
Academic Council Meeting
January 15, 2009; 10 a.m. – 12 Noon; HTC133

Members Present: Angela Anderson, Robert Barshay, Janet Carlson, Sandra Dunnington, Shannon Fleishman, Mike Gavin, Oliver Hansen, Carolyn Hoffman, Mark Hubley, Fatina Lamar-Taylor, Ed McLaughlin, Alan Mickelson, Nick Plants, Barbara Sanders, Scott Sinex, Rhonda Spells, Charles Thomas

Others Present: Eldon Baldwin, June Fordham, Tia Roebuck, Joe Rossmeier, Verna Teasdale

Absent: None

The meeting was called to order by S. Dunnington at 10:10 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved with the following change – address Academic Standing agenda item in the first portion of the meeting.

Approval of Dec 2nd and 11th Minutes

The December 2nd minutes were approved by M. Hubley who chaired the meeting and will be circulated to the Council for approval at the next meeting.

The December 11th minutes have not yet been edited. They will be circulated for approval at the next Council meeting.

Information/Discussion Items

Update on General Education Meeting – N. Plants

N. Plants reported that a GenEd meeting was held on January 14th to review the five courses that were submitted for gen ed status in fall 2008. Per recent Council discussions, there will be a freeze on submission of courses for gen ed approval after these courses are reviewed and until a new gen ed program is initiated. The approval request forms received for gen ed courses revealed radical misunderstandings about what a gen ed course entails. Aims of courses, in terms of gen ed outcomes, were not addressed at all in many cases. Some submissions had used the new outcomes that have not been accepted yet. Therefore, those courses cannot be approved for gen ed status since we are still operating under old outcomes. As it stands, most of the five courses in question, as they are currently proposed, are not eligible for gen ed status. Only one course met every state requirement except one. Some of the application forms approved by chairs and deans should not have been approved. Council members with courses in their area (deans, chairs) were advised to more rigorously evaluate courses before signing off on them.

It was noted that most faculty members were not aware that they had to make certain distinctions when their proposals were submitted (e.g. - must make it clear which area/category the course falls under). Individual members of the GenEd Committee will be

contacting the involved faculty and requesting additional information, such as the requested gen ed category, before final decisions are made. It was clarified that any **new** courses submitted could still be approved as a course, even though it may not receive gen ed status at this time.

One area in which we do have some leeway for course approval falls under the MHEC category of “Emerging Issues”. The only area currently approved under this category is *Computer Literacy*, with CIS1010 Computer Literacy being the only course to satisfy that requirement. Currently the college has no course in the MHEC “Interdisciplinary” category.

Future Directions:

The GenEd committee will now take data from the January 22nd meeting regarding the preamble with the aim of turning the preamble into a philosophy of education that includes a philosophy of general education.

S. Dunnington asked that the GenEd committee map out a timeline for completing the philosophy and the subsequent gen ed program revision in a way that the final product corresponds to catalog production and does not leave nearly a year gap between final outcomes and implementation.

Revisions of CLOs – C. Hoffman and M. Gavin

C. Hoffman completed a content analysis and subsequently gave an overview of departmental input. ****See suggested changes noted on handout****

There were no changes to items 6, 8 or 9. The greatest change would be to item #3. Due to the fact that one goal was to clarify the outcomes (and “thinking processes” required further definition) a number of departments suggested that the original wording be used.

There was some discussion of defining “college level” (as used in item #1). It was clarified that the state of Maryland has determined what meets “college-level” standards.

Actions

A motion was made to approve the CLOs as revised (preamble included) based on departmental input. The motion passed with 1 abstention.

S. Dunnington will distribute the final version of the CLOs at division meetings later today.

Tegrity Program – E. Baldwin, J. Rossmeier, M. Doss

E. Baldwin and J. Rossmeier gave an overview of the Tegrity Program – a learning activity capture system (see handout). J. Rossmeier, E. Baldwin, and M. Doss were impressed by a Tegrity demo at Coppin State University (#1 in Maryland in terms of technology use) which included a panel of about a dozen students who have successfully used this software in classes. Students on the panel stated that they now prefer classes with instructors who are using Tegrity. In addition, web access is not necessary to capture classes and it is convenient for field trips, as it is compatible with laptops. Coppin allocates incentive funds for each faculty member who is willing to pilot the program.

It was proposed is that PGCC participate in a free pilot this semester to be used by three faculty members. Each student in the respective courses would receive their own login. Some faculty members, including Eldon Baldwin (mathematics), Swazette Young (psychology), and C. White (legal studies) have already expressed interest in participating in this free trial.

The caveat is that the Tegrity trial is free *pending a signed agreement to continue and would be hosted remotely. Participation in the pilot would commit the college to using this system for a certain period of time.* J. Rossemeir would be responsible for negotiating the final contract agreement and cost. With the agreement of Council members, J. Rossemeir would like to get a proposal together so he can identify all estimated costs for the next three years. In the meantime, he gave the following baseline estimate:

Full system for unlicensed campus-wide use: \$75K

Less than full-site license would likely start at \$25K

Council was asked to consider the following:

- whether this is the best investment of college funds in technology
- whether faculty would use Tegrity
- given that we currently do not have a learning technology plan in place, how would this fit into such a plan
- what would be the effect on attendance
- copyright issues when showing a video or using a copyrighted document
- privacy rights

Without an overarching technology learning plan, S. Dunnington questioned how this initiative would/should fit into technology needs of the Academic Affairs Area.

S. Sinex suggested that, in this day and age when lecture should be on its way out, he doesn't think this software is the way to go. It was his suggestion that Podcasting would make more sense and the money would be better spent on making every classroom on the campus state-of-the-art.

Council members shared their thoughts on better ways the money could be spent, including:

- internet accessibility in all classrooms.
- exploring the same capabilities in Sympodium and Blackboard.

It was unanimously agreed that Council will not approve the Tegrity pilot due to cost (it would not be the best use of funds) and lack of a learning technology plan.

Establishing an Academic Affairs Assessment Committee

The next step in working with the new CLOs is determining how the Academic Affairs Area will assess the skills of graduating students in relation to the 10 outcomes.

M. Gavin and S. Dunnington have discussed where course mapping will fit in to this process. It was suggested that the Council move forward with course mapping in order to evaluate what opportunities students have within courses to reach the CLOs.

S. Dunnington pointed out that each of these initiatives is crucial but currently there is no group/committee on campus dedicated to addressing these issues. Additionally, there is no group responsible for integrating course assessment, program assessment, MAPP, and CLO assessment efforts.

S. Dunnington pointed out that many colleges address assessment initiatives (including the University of Maryland College Park) by establishing a committee comprised of representatives/liasons to a larger assessment committee from every department. Therefore, S. Dunnington suggested that a similar assessment committee be established for Academic Affairs. It was suggested that B. Gage, M. Gavin, and a member of the OPIR staff also serve on the proposed assessment committee.

Action:

It was determined that committee positions would be as follows:

- *Assessment Coordinator when hired (S. Dunnington will give up the third administrative assistant in the VPAA's office for this position)*
- *2 representatives from each academic division*
- *B. Gage, M. Gavin, OPIR Rep*
- *B. Gage and M. Gavin would be considered separate from division representatives.*

This committee will be assembled by the end of February by S. Dunnington.

Reorganization within Academic Affairs

S. Dunnington stated that college-wide reorganization is now being addressed by each Vice President's area. The process is aimed to: 1) ensure that service to students and the community is effective as efficient as possible, and 2) allow Academic Affairs to be more flexible in responding to changing community needs and 3) possibly free up resources for new initiatives.

The latter is especially imperative in light of current economic conditions. In an attempt to be proactive in anticipation of additional state budget cuts to the college and revenue deficits resulting from not meeting enrollment targets, some FY09 expenditures (i.e. furniture and equipment, travel) will likely be frozen. The Senior Team is making every effort to manage the budget in a way that will avoid resorting to furloughs and that will cushion the blow of likely deeper budget cuts next year.

Therefore, the reorganization efforts are looking at where there is redundancy of effort in Academic Affairs and across the college and/or whether we are using staff efficiently. The Academic Affairs reorganization plan will be drafted by the first of March; the initial plan is being developed by the deans, Academic Administrators, the Department Chairs, and the Senate President and Vice President.

S. Dunnington met last week with department chairs, deans, and administrators to work on a variety of activities focused on reorganization. They will meet again (including M. Hubley as Senate President) the afternoon of January 26th with the goal of developing a structured plan

to present to faculty at VP Chats, Faculty Senate, and Division meetings. Feedback from extension center staff is also needed.

The following New positions are needed now and must be accommodated via the reorganization process:

- Assessment coordinator
- New program development position

Action Items

Academic Standings – B. Sanders

Council revisited Academic Standings and considered what type of credit should be used as a grade point index (GPA/QPA discussion).

The current policy has been programmed with the CEUs. Council members were asked to consider:

- Whether to move ahead or not
- How this impacts Financial Aid

Datatel has come up with a temporary way to work around this as changing developmental courses to credit may cause complications with Colleague. We are in a state of limbo until we figure out what the exact impact on Financial Aid would be. There are at least three other Community Colleges in the state that give some form of credit for developmental education courses.

It was clarified that developmental education courses cannot be offered for academic credit because MHEC regulations specify that only college-level work can be used as degree/academic credit.

Action

Wording changes and the previously approved table of minimum standards will go on the next Board Agenda. B. Sanders and S. Dunnington will work on the wording. B. Sanders and S. Dunnington will get the final version of the policy changes out to group as soon as possible.

Use of TP Grade

S. Dunnington informed the Council that, in the past, a grade of TP (Toward Passing) has been given for developmental math courses offered in a self-paced format. Students in the courses had to demonstrate that they completed four chapters of the work in order to receive the TP grade. Students then were allowed to register for the same course in subsequent semesters to complete the required work and receive a grade of Pass or Fail.

When the request to assign letter grades for developmental courses was received several years ago (to be instituted in fall 2008), there was no request to retain the TP grade for the self-paced courses. However, faculty put the TP grade in the course syllabi for fall 2008 and

assigned it to a number of students. S. Dunnington informed the Council that **she agreed to honor TPs for Fall 2008 only**. She informed the DVM faculty that she cannot honor TP grades thereafter because it was not requested in the request to administer letter grades and because she has significant pedagogical issues with that designation. Hereafter, the course catalog will note that “TP” is not awarded after Fall 2008. In a meeting with developmental faculty regarding this matter yesterday, they were informed that they must provide data to the Academic Council if they wish to consider reinstating TP or a similar grade for the self-paced courses. She told them they must also have very good data to support their request.

Reports

NONE

Questions and Answers

Open Discussion – Q&A

M. Gavin noted that a suggested revision to first day handouts (the date for students to register for classes the next semester) was missing. It was clarified that M. Doss has made the revision.

V. Teasdale discussed the textbook affordability issue. ISBN numbers must be included in course syllabi and on the bookstore website. A discussion with Dr. M. Taibi must take place regarding how this information will get posted to the website.

**Setting Next Meeting Agenda –February 12, 2009; 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
HTC 133**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.