

**Prince George's Community College  
Academic Council Meeting Minutes  
March 12, 2009  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.; CAT 133**

**Members Present:**

Angela Anderson, Robert Barshay, Janet Carlson, Sandra Dunnington, Mike Gavin, Mark Hubley, Oliver Hansen, Carolyn Hoffman, Lynda Ihekwe, Alan Mickelson, Nick Plants, Barbara Sanders, Scott Sinex, Rhonda Spells, Fatina Lamar-Taylor, Charles Thomas

**Members Absent:**

Shannon Fleishman

**Others Present:**

Clifford Collins, Heidi Elam, Eldon Baldwin, Laura Ellsworth, Tia Roebuck, Brenda Teal, Verna Teasdale, Lindsey Dodson

**Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved as circulated.

**Approval of Minutes: February 26, 2009**

The minutes were approved as circulated.

**Information/Discussion Items**

**Follow-up on Gen Ed Issues – N. Plants**

**Report on AAC&U Gen Ed Conference – N. Plants & A. Anderson**

S. Dunnington, T. Bridger, N. Plants, A. Anderson, C. Collins, and V. Teasdale attended the AAC&U Conference and shared the major points:

- Distinguishing between schools that emphasize a core model vs. a distribution model of gen ed classes (PGCC has a hybrid)
  - o Understanding where PGCC fits in to this framework and why one way works for us over the other
  
- The conference dealt predominantly with 4-year colleges. This is an issue because:
  - o Transfer is an additional concern for Community Colleges
  - o Transfer concerns lend to a slant towards the Distribution model
  - o Schools who want “well-rounded” students will lean towards the Core model.
  - o We have to be more transfer-minded than 4-year institutions
  - o How do we balance students’ need to be well rounded and transfer successfully?
  - o The magic number we’re trying to reach is a maximum of 36 [in gen ed]
  - o Discussed whether we should shoot for a lower number

- Looked at the requirements we currently have; the one requirement not mandated is the CIS requirement, i.e., emerging issue; should this be one of our prescriptive courses?
- Rather than being prescriptive, it was found that a lot of other community colleges give the students more options/recommendations/recommended courses to choose from.
- Other institutions presented on their process of re-evaluating their respective gen ed requirements. C. Collins found Dr. Ned Lauff's discussion on the role of academic advising in gen ed course development (how those courses are assessed, etc.) particularly helpful. Received a useful book *Why Do I Take This Course?* (why a student asks this question, how we best answer the question, etc.); Suggested that every advisor who works with students read this publication.
  - It was suggested that, as the gen ed committee plans for the future, this book might be a useful guide to addressing those questions with students.
- PGCC is not the only institution going through this process. In terms of assessment, the College is actually ahead of some schools. In the second plenary session, assessment plans and gen ed curriculum mapping were addressed. There was emphasis on making sure that, as you develop an assessment plan, to make sure it's meaningful, manageable, and sustainable. The speaker advised not to rely solely on external standardized testing as a means of assessment; but to use internal evaluation methods/measures as well. It was also suggested that colleges develop their own assessment mechanism.
- In a break-out session by CCBC, their staff shared the plan they have in place which uses standardized rubrics across all courses for gen ed assessment. They have infused multiple outcomes into every aspect of course assessment (minimum of 4 or 5). We should consider CCBC a model for assessment.
- In another session on course re-design, a presenter from UMES discussed re-designing course delivery to suit student needs. Some faculty members who have done this notice an improvement in grades and student attitudes as a result. It was also cost affective.
- Attendees also received a publication entitled *Revising General Education: Avoiding the Potholes (received a number of copies of this.)*
- A number of colleges publicize their core learning outcomes (e.g. Miami-Dade College). They openly share the logic behind their core outcomes with students by distributing folders and posting banners around campus.

It was clarified that revision of the gen ed program should not hold up new **program** development. There is only a moratorium on any additional gen ed courses right now, which should last into next academic year (2009-2010). At that time, the Council will decide whether to maintain that moratorium.

### **Course Mapping Process and Suggested Timeline – M. Gavin**

*(see handout)*

#### Background:

The goal of the course map is to:

1. Reduce the number of courses to be assessed departmentally
2. Provide some internal measurement of program and general education outcomes through course assessment.

The Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs; formerly Core Educational Outcomes) for PGCC have existed for some time, but there has been no way to measure or prove that students were adequately exposed to each of the outcomes. The course map should serve as a solution to this problem.

When the final course mapping process is approved, departments will be expected to engage in discussions about which assignments and courses address specific CLOs. A rubric will be put in place that addresses the functioning skill level of students, rather than how many times they are exposed to a certain skill.

The keynote address at the conference included a presentation on this very issue. A model rubric was discussed in which faculty rated the skill level (“B”eginner, “I”ntermediate, “M”astery) of the learning outcomes listed. From that they determined whether or not students were adequately prepared by their coursework. This approach makes more sense and may be able to serve as our model at PGCC.

The ideal goal is that, in the first semester, each academic department will list each course and complete the rubric. In the second semester, these grids would be forwarded to the assessment coordinator. In the third semester, based on what this process reveals, departments, programs, and/or the assessment coordinator will identify one of the courses to be assessed on a regular basis.

***It was agreed that this process would not begin this semester. The goal is to have a final version of the document ready by the end of Spring semester, but the process will not begin until Fall 2009.***

### **Academic Affairs’ Reorganization – S. Dunnington**

S. Dunnington distributed handouts including suggested reorganization models and requested feedback from Council members. She has met with four of the Academic divisions so far and will attend the next Senate meeting to discuss. The models were also presented to the Senior Team.

Lighter type on the handout indicated a new responsibility for the respective position listed. “?” indicate that there is some question as to where a certain position would report.

It is Dr. Dukes' goal to reduce duplication in positions as much as possible. Council members were asked to bear in mind that reorganization is still very much in the discussion stage. Nothing is set in stone.

Council members were asked to consider the fact that most community colleges comparable to PGCC do not have divisions like we do. They only have departments. We are organized more like a 4-year college. The only other college as discipline specific as PGCC is Howard Community College. Some neighboring colleges have institutes in which the academic programs are housed (e.g. Anne Arundel).

It was pointed out that, thus far, model C has been more preferred over model B. In addition, N. Plants provided a model ("D") which uses the gen ed program as a guide for reorganization.

The next step will be for Dr. Dunnington to run numbers. However, this cannot be done until the models are narrowed down. The president has requested a mode be developed for consideration in which departments have been reduced by a third.

#### **Protocol for Securing Classrooms – O. Hansen**

O. Hansen addressed the recent rash of thefts and attempted thefts from classrooms in January and February. Bladen Hall, Marlboro Hall, Chesapeake Hall, and the Center for Advanced Technology were all burglarized and expensive equipment was stolen and/or damaged. He is asking for support in keeping classrooms secure and minimizing the risk of theft by establishing some protocol.

Basic Suggestions Included:

Making sure that the last person out is a faculty member who will be responsible for ensuring that the door is secured.

Don't leave students behind with the responsibility of locking doors.

Use common sense. If you see something suspicious, do something.

It was suggested that this issue be reinforced in new hire orientation. A handout should be distributed to faculty that emphasizes classroom security protocol. Access to classrooms is an issue that must be addressed with urgency.

It was clarified that a log does exist for those who use a key card to enter rooms. However, it is unclear who has this log.

L. Ellsworth suggested attaching alarms to projectors. S. Dunnington agreed that such deterrents should be explored.

**O. Hansen will draft classroom security protocol, distribute it to Council members, and follow-up at the next meeting.**

**S. Dunnington will follow up with T. Knapp.**

**Update on Professional Development Offerings – Printed Schedule for rest of Semester – A. Mickelson (*see handout*)**

A. Mickelson distributed a schedule of Professional Development offerings for the remainder of the semester.

He reported that the Blended Learning Seminar was successful with about 18 people attending and that R. Spells suggested purchasing the CD of the seminar. S. Dunnington concurred. *A. Mickelson will order the CD.*

Twelve individuals attended the “Chat with the Textbook Affordability Task Force” presentation held today. A student co-op bookstore was one of the ideas discussed as an option to the current bookstore arrangement

S. Dunnington reported that she has discussed the paperback books issue with T. Knapp, and that will be one of the issues addressed once we meet with the bookstore.

**Update on *Faculty Handbook Revisions* – M. Hubley**

There are currently 18 faculty members editing the faculty handbook. Although he requested updates by the end of the month, he has received feedback from only one of the groups. He hopes to have more feedback by Spring break or the end of this month.

M. Hubley also met with Lark Dobson today to discuss the process of updating the handbook. It was clarified that the handbook must also be approved by the VPAA, the college attorney and the Executive Assistant to the President. His goal is to have an updated handbook by the end of the year, and to reduce the existing size by half.

**Action Items**

NONE

**Reports**

NONE

**Questions and Answers**

**Next Agenda**

**Textbook group – T. Bridger**

**Web portal demo – O. Hansen**

**Secure Classrooms Protocol – O. Hansen**

**Fall 2009 Opening Week – A. Mickelson**