

**Prince George's Community College**  
**Academic Council Meeting Minutes**  
**August 27, 2009**  
**10:00 – 12:00 p.m.; CAT 133**

**Members Present:** Angela Anderson, Robert Barshay, Mara Doss, Sandra Dunnington, Mike Gavin, Mark Hubley, Oliver Hansen, Carolyn Hoffman, Andrea Lex, Alan Mickelson, Ed McLaughlin, Nick Plants, Barbara Sanders, Scott Sinex, Fatina Lamar-Taylor, Charles Thomas

**Others Present:** Vera Bagley, Teresa Bridger, Tia Roebuck, John Rosicky

**Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved as circulated.

**Approval of Minutes: March 12; April 23; May 14; May 21, 2009**

The minutes of March 12 and April 23 were distributed. Any additions or corrections are to be sent to T. Roebuck by Thursday, September 3, 2009. (No changes were forthcoming; the minutes were approved as circulated.) Minutes from May 14<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> are out for review by presenters and will be approved at the next meeting.

**Reports**

**MHEC Decisions** – S. Dunnington described the MHEC process for objecting to new program proposals and explained the outcomes of Prince George's Community College's objections to TESST College's proposals for an AAS program in Health Information Technology and Computer Network Technology.

**Information/Discussion Items**

**Use of "Q" Grades – V. Bagley**

- **When to use**
- **When due**
- **How to handle "tricky situations"**
- **Versus "F" grade**

(see *Q Grade* handout)

**BACKGROUND**

A "Q" Grade is defined in the PGCC catalog as follows:

*A grade assigned by the instructor to a student who has never attended the class or stopped attending during the first 20 percent of the course.*

A "Q" is treated as a withdrawal, dated at the end of the third week of the term, or the equivalent. Once assigned, a Q is not replaced with a W.

Many faculty members are unsure about when "Q" grades are appropriate.

- What should be done with students who do the bare minimum to pass (e.g. do not attend until the near the third week of class then disappear again or just show up near the end of class etc.)?
- What should be done with students that were never or rarely seen in class?
- Who can clear a “Q” grade?

There is also concern regarding financial aid students who are not attending classes.

Thus far, the practice has been that a student receives a “Q” grade if they never show up for class.

It was clarified that, in order to clear a “Q” grade, the faculty member must submit a change of grade form. He/She cannot change the grade in Owl Link. Although the student should *not* receive a grade change if he/she missed 10–20% of the class, about two dozen such grade changes do occur per semester. Many of these changes are because the student is on two rosters and has never shown up in one of the two sections.

Council agreed on the following:

- Students who never show up or disappear early on in the course (within the first 20% of the class), receive a “Q”
- Students receive an “F” with a date, if they attend the first part (20% or more) of the course and never return thereafter.
- By the time a course has gotten 30-35% of the way through, whether or not a “Q” grade will be issued must be determined. If a faculty member is unsure if a student will continue to attend, after showing up near the 20% portion of the class, the instructor can wait to issue the grade when another 10-15% of the course has passes. For financial aid purposes, this information must be reported by midterm.
- Instructors should be prompted about 20% of the way through a course to check attendance and participation of students.

**S. Dunnington will draft language regarding “Q” Grades (see attached) and forward the document to V. Bagley and Council Members for review. The document will then be distributed to faculty.**

#### **New Members – S. Dunnington**

New members of the Council were welcomed. Mara Doss will now serve on the Academic Council with Rhonda Spells as her alternate (as Mara is the e-learning liaison to Academic Affairs).

Dr. Andrea Lex has also joined from OPIR(A) as a resource member (replacing Shannon Smythe).

#### **Documenting Textbook Choices – T. Bridger**

Background:

T. Bridger, Chair of the Textbook Affordability Task Force provided Council members with a summary of the Textbook Affordability Bill, which was passed by the Maryland Legislature in spring 2009 and went into effect July 1, 2009.

T. Bridger clarified that the Prince George's Community College's best practices guidelines have not been distributed yet as final approval was pending at the last Council meeting until they were reviewed by staff in WDCE. It was recommended that Council keep the document as guidelines or a draft. It was suggested that the document be referred to as a "working document" versus a "draft".

***The working document was adopted and will be dated as of today. This document should be distributed to all faculty via department chairs.***

Council must decide how required data on textbook adoption decisions will be gathered and reported to MHEC. Though the final report is not due to MHEC until December 2010, PGCC must submit a report to MHEC this December (2009) as well. Although MHEC has indicated that a form, or other means of collecting the data, would be provided to colleges, this has not happened yet; so Council must begin collecting data without the benefit of an MHEC-generated template. To that end, T. Bridger has been working with Paul Jackson in OPIR to develop a template for the college faculty to use.

It was clarified that:

- Separate ISBNs will be necessary for individual books as well as bundles respectively (so that students are not forced to purchase an entire bundle).
- Department chairs must sign off on the textbook data collection forms (see *Textbook Form 1 and Textbook Form 2* handouts)
- The textbook data collection forms must be completed prior to next semester (e.g. – complete the form in Fall 2009 for Spring 2010)
- Information from the textbook data collection form will eventually be entered into a database.
- It is unclear whether the information should be collected by division, department, etc. This is an issue.
- The language is clear in stating that colleges are to begin collecting data as of July 1

It was suggested that, since an electronic form is already used by the bookstore to order textbooks, there could be some way to incorporate this form into the data collection process (vs. starting from scratch). The textbook information for would then only be necessary when switching textbooks.

It was also suggested that the draft form be renamed, "Data Collection Points" (vs. Data Collection Form) because the information will be stored in a spreadsheet (not on hard copy forms). Council members asked OPIR staff to explore the possibility of using a web-based form which would automatically enter information in the database.

It was clarified that the technical aspect would be addressed later. The issue at hand is whether or not there is additional information that should be added to the data collection forms. Will we capture the necessary data with the questions listed on the form? Council members went through each form item and the MACC handout to determine whether required information was addressed.

Council members agreed that students should be informed in the course syllabi whether or not they can use previous editions of the textbook(s) for that course. It was clarified that information must be made available, via the bookstore website, to students by specific dates (May 1 and December 1); and that faculty members must clarify in their syllabi whether students can use a previous editions of the textbook(s) for that course and/or whether there are pieces of a bundle pack that are not available for purchase.

T. Bridger informed Council members that the next steps for the textbook committee will include working on recommendations and a timeline for the informational campaign. Once the information campaign is settled, PGCC will be in complete compliance with the textbook affordability law. She will bring this information back to Council for review. In addition, any changes from today will be presented to the Chairs council on September 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Council members reviewed the requirements set forth in the MACC Textbook Competition and Affordability Act of 2009 compliance document to determine whether or not PGCC is adequately addressing each requirement in the data requested via the proposed collection forms. Council focused on item **IV** specifically (“*A process by which faculty members acknowledge the following...*”) and determined the following:

- **IV b. If selecting a different edition, the content difference as reported by the publisher and that the new edition is needed due to substantial content difference**

It was questioned whether the forms will capture the information that the new edition is needed due to substantial content difference. There should be language included to address the change to a new edition for reasons other than content difference (e.g. If a specific edition is all the publisher makes available at the time, etc.)

Council members agreed that this must be clarified. T. Bridger will add language addressing the decision not to change textbooks based on time constraints.

- **IVd. That supplemental material included in a bundle is intended for use in the course** AND
- **IVe. That certain bundles and bundled items may not be available separately from a publisher**

It was suggested that these items have been not been met/would not be adequately captured by the form. It was questioned whether we are asking faculty to verify this information. S. Dunnington does not believe the bundle issue is adequately addressed in the form. Additionally, it was suggested that clarification on bundle pack rules should be a part of the information campaign to faculty.

It was suggested that OPIR, the campus bookstore, and Technology could work with the Task Force on developing the most efficient way to collect textbook data.

### **Update on Course Mapping – M. Gavin**

#### Background

The goal of the rubric is to find out whether students meet or have an opportunity to meet all of the learning outcome goals in their specific program. Last semester, at the last meeting in May, the Council was still debating number 3 on the CLO rubric. (see *CLO Rubric* handout)

The language of number 3 has since been revised. M. Gavin took the revised document to the Academic Affairs Assessment Committee on August 26<sup>th</sup>, where further revisions were made. The assessment committee pointed out that the face-to-face and online students may not be afforded the same opportunities to meet goals (e.g. any of the goals relative to speaking in front of the instructor and class). Therefore, directions will be given to enter any course taught both face-to-face and on-line separately in order to distinguish between what CLOs are addressed in online vs. face-to-face courses.

It was clarified that the rubric will be completed/filled out by departments and given to the assessment coordinator. It will be submitted electronically.

Revisions were made to the rubric as follows:

- 1 = This core learning outcome **is introduced**.
- 2 = This core learning outcome **is developed** ~~and practiced with feedback~~.
- 3 = This core learning outcome **is applied** as a critical ~~and is an important~~ skill and/or concept.

Council members agreed with the tentative timeline set forth in the document (please see *Course Map Timeline* handout).

### **Managing Swine Flu Outbreak in Academic Affairs – All**

Due to time constraints, this issue was tabled until the September 10 meeting

#### Action Items

**NONE**

#### Questions and Answers

**Next Meeting Date and Time: September 10, 2009; 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.**

#### **Next Agenda:**

- Swine Flu** – Pam Thomas, All
- Secure Classrooms Protocol** – O. Hansen

**Gen Ed Report – N. Plants**

**CCSSE Data Report – A. Lex and P. Jackson Sept. 24, 2009**

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