

Prince George's Community College
Academic Council Meeting
April 23, 2009
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.; CAT133

Members Present: A. Anderson, R. Barshay, S. Dunnington, S. Fleishman, M. Gavin, O. Hansen, C. Hoffman, M. Hubley, F. Lamar-Taylor, A. Mickelson, N. Plants, B. Sanders, S. Sinex, R. Spells, C. Thomas

Members Absent: L. Ihekwe, E. McLaughlin

Others Present: V. Alford, T. Bridger, L. Dodson, H. Elam, B. Johnson, M. Kramer, M. Matthews, F. Philips, T. O'Donnell, S. Richardson, E. Robbins, T. Roebuck, S. Williams

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

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved with action delayed on the Textbook Affordability issues. It was moved to an information item only.

Approval of March 12th Minutes

Deferred.

Information/Discussion Items

Textbook Affordability Task Force – T. Bridger

T. Bridger distributed a handout of MACC's interpretation of the bill containing major provisions that will affect PGCC. MACC will probably further revise this document in cooperation with MHEC. The bill did pass. Prior to this, the textbook affordability task force expanded its membership and reviewed the bill for its impact on PGCC. The taskforce is considering electronic options, buying books new and used, international books, etc. S. Sinex also conducted a survey with his CHM 101 students about electronic books and In addition, L. Logan gave T. Bridger a survey of American college students' use of library e-books. According to the survey, PGCC's student population does not have an overwhelming interest in e-books. Mostly the western part of the country and people in certain programs seem to prefer this method.

T. Bridger informed the group that she is waiting to hear from the college attorney regarding the bookstore contract.

There is a statewide textbook affordability taskforce with the community colleges that is based at Frederick Community College. The taskforce is considering how to go about justifying textbook choices (should faculty members use a book different than one used the previous semester.) Faculty members would have to explain why they are/are not adopting a new edition and/or why previous editions would not hold up. Usually, this is

due to the publisher indicating that a certain edition is no longer available or the bookstore indicating that it cannot get enough used copies to support our numbers. In any case, a template is needed. MACC is looking at developing a template. T. Bridger attended a meeting on Tuesday for Faculty Advisory Council, and MHEC suggested that it will develop a template because MHEC will be responsible for collecting the information to be reported back to the assembly. The question for the taskforce at this point is should we just wait for a template and do nothing else (which means textbook prices would not drop for students)? If so, we will also need to develop a system (see number 5 on the handout) to collect and return of the information to MHEC. It was also questioned whether the taskforce should continue to investigate affordable options or just issue a list of best practices to departments and divisions.

S. Dunnington clarified that MACC has requested that all community colleges come up with their own best practices. The textbook taskforce is currently working on a draft.

T. Bridger will send the Best Practices draft to S. Dunnington's attention to be forwarded to Council members for review.

It was also explained that there is also a feasibility study regarding textbook rentals, digital marketplace, and electronic textbooks in the bill (Pt. 12b).

There was some question about the phrase "best practices process." One of the questions that came up at the FAC meeting was what exactly "process" means (see number 2 on the handout). No set process or timeline is given. For now, it's best to follow the procedures set forth in the bill. The bill does create a process that faculty must go through and acknowledge at every step. MHEC will then collect data from public institutions and report it back to the state. It is still unclear how this process will be executed. MHEC does not want to over-prescribe anything; however, colleges must meet requirements set forth by law. The first report will not be until 2011, so it is feasible that by the fall 2009 semester, this process may not be in place as of yet. Information is due to MHEC by December 1, 2011 and their report to the state is due December 31, 2011. It was decided that it is best to have a draft best policies in place by July 1st.

T. Bridger suggested that we may have to come up with a template in the meantime. She has emailed M. O'Leary to see if we should do something similar to what other community colleges are doing. She is waiting for a response from him.

No one is sure when implementation should begin.

In addition, S. Dunnington apprised council members of a FOIA request she recently received for information such as, textbooks ordered, number of students in classes, ISBN numbers, course numbers etc. for any and all textbooks ordered Spring, Summer, and Fall 2009. We are responding to the request and we will comply. It turns out that it came from a company which competes with Nebraska. We have requested this information from Nebraska to provide it to the requesting party. This kind of request may become more frequent.

Gen Ed Proposal re: General Studies Option – N. Plants

As previously discussed, in January it was discovered that our Gen Ed requirements are out of compliance with state law and we are working on correcting that. The catalog copy on gen ed degree requirements is also inconsistent with the current information in the college code. It has been recommended that Council hear a recommendation from the committee, pose any further questions, and vote at the next meeting. This will give departments time to make any necessary corrections to their overall requirements in the fall of 2009.

It was clarified that the MHEC Requirements are on page 179. The current requirements of General Study are on page 66 (problem area).

N. Plants distributed a copy of the code illustrating the fact that the catalog copy is not consistent (see handout). The handout referenced the most recent change in the Gen Ed code which occurred November 2006, and these changes were not reflected in the last two catalogs.

The committee has agreed to put forth 2 interim proposals:

- a literal code COMAR proposal
- a proposal in line with COMAR including some of the flexibility they were asked to include (see handout)

Revisions would *not* appear in the next catalog as there is not enough time to get it in to the printer with the rest of the catalog.

A motion was made to adopt the second proposal. However, it was clarified that no action can be taken until the next meeting.

B. Sanders suggested that, for future reference, we may not want to be so specific about what satisfies a certain requirement (e.g. Literature). It was clarified that this will be addressed as the philosophy of education and subsequent gen ed revisions are developed.

Council seemed to overwhelmingly prefer the second option. S. Dunnington will work with the second option as a draft revision to the code. N. Plants will make edits, and send the document to T. Roebuck to be distributed to Council members. S. Dunnington asked Council members to stress that this is an *interim* proposal change when discussing with constituencies.

The Council will vote on this at next meeting.

Web Portal Demo – O. Hansen

O. Hansen, H. Elam, and R. Spells represented the Portal Advisory committee and gave a demonstration of the new web portal (intranet).

The committee has been working for months on a web portal which provides direct

access to students and faculty. Students will be targeted as the initial population as they are more homogeneous in terms of what they need to function.

Timeline:

- Pilot with online students this summer semester
- Extend the pilot to online students population this Fall
- Make portal available to all students by Spring 2010

A recent usability test with students was successful. Students will use the same login and password they currently use with Owl Link.

H. Elam gave a portal demonstration. One function is that students will be able to build their own calendars. The portal will also contain announcements (critical information only), a bulletin board (for other pertinent information), a login to Blackboard and the student handbook. Other features include My Links, a customizable portion of the portal; a survey and feedback section (to monitor satisfaction with the portal); campus events, RSS feeds, weather, links to Owl Link, the Distance Learning site, and direct access to student email (once this is available).

The portal serves the purpose of offering direct access to everything a student needs in one place. A live chat will also be piloted so that students can get answers faster related to online courses. Specific committees and groups can have their own sites/pages as well.

Fall Opening Week – A. Mickelson

Return dates are as follows:

Chairs return August 17th

Faculty return August 24th

Classes begin August 31st

Faculty will support the registration process in the mornings and evenings. J. Rosicky and A. Anderson are working on this. Therefore, the various activities scheduled for the week will take place in the afternoon. A. Mickelson distributed a draft schedule for the fall '09 opening week schedule of activities.

He noted that the schedule includes various elements: meetings, the newly hired faculty programs, various professional development workshops, various trainings, and discipline-related activities (e.g. English Dept symposium).

Questions/Feedback

- Do we need to schedule an activity around CLOs? No
- There are usually 4 meetings held during this week. One is a college-wide meeting (S. Dunnington will check with Dr. Dukes inform A. Mickelson of her wishes), Academic Affairs meetings, division meetings, and department meetings. In what sequence should these meeting occur?
Council members agreed that the Academic Affairs meeting will go first followed by division and then department meetings.

The deans and department chairs will coordinate the various activities in their areas.

The new idea of scheduling discipline-related activities to be developed and implemented within departments was accepted.

The question of whether adjunct faculty meetings be connected to an evening Academic Affairs meeting, to department meetings or both was discussed but no conclusion was reached. A. Mickelson will meet with the department chairs for further discussions.

S. Dunnington noted that there will be more faculty recognition this fall that focuses on the past year's accomplishments.

SENSE Testing: PGCC Questions – S. Fleishman

S. Fleishman distributed a summary with 12 additional questions to be included with the SENSE survey. SENSE is a nationwide survey of community college students designed to collect information concerning students' first impressions of the college during the Fall semester. This questionnaire will be given the third week in the Fall semester and provide some formative data on student's early experiences. It is also designed to complement CCSSE, which PGCC participated in most recently during the Spring 2008 semester.

S. Dunnington and S. Fleishman chose the final questions from 75 pages of validated items based on institutional priorities and other planned assessment activities over the next year. N. Plants pointed out he wouldn't have a high degree of confidence in student's responses to some of the selected questions, especially so early in the semester (numbers 7 & 10, for example). S. Fleishman and S. Dunnington explained that the questions can be changed for any future administrations should the college decide to continue with the SENSE instrument, but also that this would be encouraged based on lessons learned from the pilot administration.

It was clarified that GFU results are now posted on the OPIR website.

Action Items

NONE

Reports

NONE

Questions and Answers

Open Discussion – Q&A

Setting Next Meeting Agenda – May 14th, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m., CAT 133

- Michigan Test Scores
- Gen Studies Recommendations re: Gen Ed Options
- PAS 101: Next Steps
- Course Mapping

- Fall Opening Week

May 21st, 10:00 a.m. – noon (T. Roebuck will send the appointment and find a room)

- Evaluation/Assessment of Council Efficacy
- Secure Classrooms Protocol
- Directions for Culminating Experiences

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.