

**Prince George's Community College**  
**Academic Council Meeting**  
**May 14, 2009**  
**3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.; CAT133**

**Members Present:** Alan Anderson, Robert Barshay, Sandra Dunnington, Shannon Fleishman, Mike Gavin, Carolyn Hoffman, Lynda Ihekwe, Alan Mickelson, Nick Plants, Barbara Sanders, Scott Sinex, Fatina Taylor, Charles Thomas

**Members Absent:** Oliver Hansen, Mark Hubley, Ed McLaughlin, Rhonda Spells

**Others Present:** Clover Baker-Brown, Teresa Bridger, Marlene Cohen, Melinda Frederick, William Gardner, Marianne Grayston, Melinda Kramer, Martha Matthews, Frank Phillips, Bev Reed, Esther Robbins, Tia Roebuck, Sherelle Williams, Darlyn Wolvin

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

**Approval of Agenda**

The Agenda was approved with the following revision:

Fall Opening Week was moved to top of the agenda

**Approval of March 12<sup>th</sup> and April 23<sup>rd</sup> Minutes**

The minutes were not available at this time, so approval was deferred.

**Information/Discussion Items**

**Fall Opening Week – A. Mickelson**

A. Mickelson distributed a final draft of the Fall Welcome Back week schedule. He recommended that the lunch be discontinued due to that fact that there is no meeting prior to lunch and eliminating it will keep costs down. He is looking into getting refreshment platters instead and awaiting an estimate from Food Services. In addition, there will be no Adjunct Faculty Workshop in the evening.

**Michigan Test Scores – E. Robbins**

**BACKGROUND**

Esther Robbins and Bill Gardner provided the following background information:

The Michigan Test is a multiple choice placement exam issued to ESOL students (plus a writing sample) and has been in use since the mid-70s. There are no state regulations or agreements among the community colleges regarding pre-determined cut-off scores. At PGCC the student's Michigan Test will place them in a particular course; however, results of the writing sample may then move the student into a lower or higher level course. Recently, it has been observed that some adjusting of the cut-off scores on the Michigan Test results should reduce "replacing" the student on the basis of the writing sample. The Michigan Test score is NOT shared with the student. If a student places too low in ESOL, they cannot enroll as a full-time credit student at PGCC.

In years past, ESOL students largely came just to learn a second language. However, most PGCC ESOL students now are refugees. Depending on where the student comes from, many of them have huge gaps in their basic education, particularly those from countries that have been in the midst of civil wars for several years resulting in non-functional education systems. It's a different challenge to teach English, or any second language for that matter, to a student who is fluent in a first language and fair to well education; but in some cases we're teaching students who can't translate because they never thoroughly learned their own language. These students have been suffering more in terms of placement scores – particularly when it comes to the writing sample portion.

Although this shift has resulted in the dissolution of ESOL programs some other schools, PGCC has not been similarly affected. With the support of advisors, and input from Marianne (who scores the writing portion of the exam), it was proposed that the cut-off scores for the Michigan Test be adjusted to meet the needs of the new student demographic by Fall 2009.

S. Dunnington requested data on the current scores/cut-off scores, how many have had to be adjusted after the writing sample, and what changes are being proposed. The data was not available for this meeting, but Bill Gardner clarified that the cut-off scores are in 10-point increments. They are suggesting a 2-3 point change.

As it is not Council procedure to vote on an item the first time around and there were no data available, **Council members requested data before the May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting** so that it could be voted on at that time. **E. Robbins will send data on PGCC Michigan Test scores to S. Dunnington and T. Roebuck to be distributed to Council members before the May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. E. Robbins will also provide information from other colleges that use the Michigan Test.**

#### **PAS 101-Next Steps (i.e., expanding to EGL 1000) – F. Taylor**

PAS 101 and CAP 103 will move to Academic Affairs in January 2010. Accuplacer results (specifically, how students placed on the reading section before and after the PAS course) will be evaluated. An assessment request was submitted to OPIR, with a deadline request of May 15<sup>th</sup>. However, due to staffing changes in OPIR, the results are not yet available. It was noted that an informal preliminary review of the scores indicated a small increase following the PAS course.

Given the fact that an assessment of PAS must be completed before a decision is made about moving it to English 1000, the Advisory Committee has recommended that PAS should not be a co-requisite with English 1000 yet. It was clarified that students being registered for English 1000 now are not being registered for PAS 101.

Academic Council members concurred with the recommendation for the PAS Advisory Council. The PAS Council will make recommendations to the Academic Council once assessment data are received.

### **Course Mapping – M. Gavin**

At last Academic Affairs Assessment Committee meeting, the debate was whether departments should identify skill level of students themselves or whether the most relevant department should determine the skill levels for specific outcomes, i.e., should the English department evaluate/determine writing skills for the CLO related to writing and then expect all disciplines/departments to use it? In either instance, Chairs would have to lead the process but it should be a department-wide discussion.

Council members were asked to consider the following when using the rubric:

- Should each area set their own discipline-specific standards or should the college have a general standard for each outcome?
- Should it be discipline specific?
  - It was agreed that each discipline should set its own standards for the various ratings in the rubric.
- Use of terminology: “proficiency” vs. “mastery”
  - Members agreed that “proficiency” may be appropriate for students in transfer degree programs but “mastery” would not be appropriate for those students. However, “mastery” might be appropriate for students in AA and AAS programs.

The Assessment committee will not meet again until fall semester. The goal is for the rubric to be ready at that time.

### **Action Items**

#### **Textbook Affordability Task Force – T. Bridger**

When the textbook task force originally looked at the document we have been using as the best practices template, it was thought that this was a policy drafted by MACC. However, the document originated with Frederick Community College – not MACC as previously believed/thought. Therefore, all references to MACC will be removed.

It was proposed that the draft document be accepted [see handout] once all references to MACC are removed. The draft should be ready by July 1<sup>st</sup> as previously discussed. It is possible that MACC will further address best practices in the Fall. If so, we will reconsider the items in our document.

It was unanimously agreed that this document would serve as best practices, **not policy**.

It was pointed out that, given that the bill doesn't go into effect until July 1<sup>st</sup>, and most textbooks would already be in place by then, it can't possibly apply to Fall 2009. Textbooks were purchased before the Bill was passed, and it has yet to be signed

There was some discussion of the lack of language in the bill pertaining to non credit. Textbooks for non credit courses are not mentioned specifically. **T. Bridger will talk to D. Lyon in WDCE to determine if they agree with the provisions of the best practices, so the document**

**is truly a college document, and not just a credit document.**

**The document was adopted as Best Practices (for PGCC) with revisions as discussed.**

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

N. Plants distributed a copy of the General Studies proposal (#2 – as discussed in the last meeting). The proposed revisions would go into effect with the next catalog. In the meantime, departments will have time in fall 2009 to make necessary adjustments to general studies options.

The proposed changes are:

**General Studies Program**

**Effective with the 2010-2011 Catalog**

<b>Program Concentration</b>	<b>(26)</b>
<b>Required General Education Courses</b>	<b>(34)</b>
English Composition I and II	(6)
Humanities (choose one from each group)	(6)
Group 1: One Speech course from the general education list	
Group 2: One Art, Music, Theater, Philosophy, Literature, or Foreign Language course from the approved general education list	
Mathematics	(3)
Science	(7)
Two courses, one of which must carry laboratory credit	
Social Sciences (choose one from each group)	(6)
Group 1: One History course from approved general education list	
Group 2: One Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, or Sociology course from approved general education list	
Computer Literacy	(3)
One additional approved general education course from either Social Sciences or Humanities	(3)
<b>Minimum Required for A.A. Degree</b>	<b>60 Credits</b>

Language in the code will be edited to reflect revisions. That portion of the Code allows the college president to make needed changes without Board approval.

**Council agreed unanimously to adopt the proposed changes to the general studies option with**

changes as previously discussed.

S. Dunnington will send the document to department chairs once she receives revisions from N. Plants. Directions will also be added to the document.

N. Plants informed Council members that the Committee is still working on a Philosophy of Education and that work will continue into the fall.

#### **Evaluation/Assessment of Council – S. Fleishman**

Council members were asked to consider what they would like to evaluate, to what degree, and how in-depth the assessment should be. A few means of assessment were suggested:

- Survey constituencies represented by Council members?
- Evaluate how long action items take in Council from inception to end.
- Get feedback from the campus community.
- Post a contact form on the Academic Council page to allow feedback.

It was clarified that it is an Academic Affairs strategic objective that we assess Council's progress.

There was some discussion of having a Council representative report to other committee meetings (e.g. Faculty Senate, etc.)

There was lengthy discussion about how Council actions are communicated to the various constituencies represented on the Council. The following means of communication were identified:

- Reported to Faculty Senate monthly
- Reported to Chairs Council monthly
- Reported to Academic Division meetings
- Semi-annual reports to CWF
- Web page is almost finished and will be communicated to the entire college community.
- Multiple discussions of actions at VP Chats

It was agreed that Council will review a timeline in which actions were completed at the next meeting.

#### Reports

NONE

#### Questions and Answers

NONE

**Setting Next Meeting Agenda – May 21, 2009; 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
CAT133**

- Secure Classrooms Protocol
- Evaluation/Assessment of Council
- Directions for Culminating Experiences
- Michigan Test Scores

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