

**Academic Council Meeting
January 21, 2010
10:30 a.m. – noon
Accokeek 221**

Members Present: A. Anderson, R. Barshay, M. Doss, S. Dunnington, M. Gavin, C. Hoffman, M. Hubley, R. Karlsson, A. Lex, A. Mickelson, N. Plants, B. Sanders, S. Sinex, C. Thomas

Members Absent: M. Emmanuel, O. Hansen, F. Taylor, E. McLaughlin

Others Present: T. Roebuck, E. Baldwin, S. Burroughs, M. Bazemore, J. Rossmeier

The meeting was called to order at 10:36 a.m. by S. Dunnington.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved with the addition of the following:

Spring 2010 Enrollment Discussion

Faculty Interest Survey for Academic Council Assessment

Approval of Minutes: December 10, 2010

The minutes were approved as circulated.

Information/Discussion Items

Enrollment Report – S. Dunnington

S. Dunnington distributed enrollment counts for January 20, 2010 (as there was no comparable enrollment report available for January 21st due to a snow day last year). Those numbers remain at least 10-12% lower than fall enrollment; S. Dunnington has spoken with V. Bagley about potential reasons for those differences. S. Dunnington was reminded that *no drops were done for spring 2009 semester until the day before classes started* (with January 23rd being the comparable day this year). Therefore, current numbers are comparing students being regularly dropped for spring 2010 with no drops last year. *When V. Bagley compares today's numbers with the comparable report for tomorrow, the numbers show:*

- Headcount is up 11%
- FTE is up 19.92%

These numbers will likely be higher when tomorrow's report is distributed due to additional enrollments today.

V. Bagley asked S. Dunnington to let deans and chairs know that, in order to accommodate additional students with the jump in capacity in many courses, classrooms may be tight for the first week or two and there may not be suitable classroom space available for all classes. **Deans and chairs were asked to apprise their faculty members of this potential issue.**

Tech Express Proposal – E. Baldwin

E. Baldwin presented a TechExpress funding proposal developed by the Technology Steering Committee (TSC) in Fall 2009 to increase technology in classrooms and the number of faculty members familiar with new classroom technology.

Highlights:

- An estimated 15% of PGCC classrooms are equipped with near state-of-the-art instructional technology.
- The TSC believes it is essential to train and support faculty members in learning how to use new technology to enhance the teaching-learning environment.
- The TechExpress proposal is based on the original model of the Online Express proposal
- Goals:
 - o to communicate and support the expectation that faculty learn new technology
 - o to train all faculty to use the state of the art technology available in the classrooms; increase faculty access and effective use of appropriate teaching and learning technologies

It was clarified that, when J. Rossmeier presented his Technology Services report to the Board in December, Dr. Dukes was in support of updating all classrooms over the next three years.

The TechExpress model is a 2-semester plan that would involve a maximum of 10 faculty members per year:

- 1) Learning semester
 - a. Semester-long seminar with introductory sessions to familiarize faculty with existing hardware and software
 - b. Participants prepare a technology-based teaching-learning plan for at least one semester-long course and discuss their ideas with other participants.
 - c. Participants attend and report on related external conferences and/or lead exploratory seminar sessions (share their preliminary plans and explore potential applications)
- 2) Teaching semester
 - a. Participants complete a technology-based teaching-learning plan for at least one semester-long course prior to the start of the semester, and use that plan to teach at least one course.
 - b. Additional supplemental seminars can be offered as needed to introduce participants to new technology, address difficulties, etc.
 - c. Participants ideas are expected to disseminate information about their teaching experiences.

It was clarified that the estimated budget for TechExpress (as it is written) would be approximately \$6,000 per person per year (or \$3,000 per person per semester). Additional costs would bring the project up to more than \$60,000 per year for 10 faculty members.

- Hardware costs will vary

- Participants will need software (the estimated cost to get start-up software is about \$150 per person).
- It is suggested that participants attend tech-based conferences in their respective disciplines.
 - o Estimated additional cost: \$10,000 (This which would vary depending on the location of the conference)
- The TSC estimates it is possible to begin this initiative in the Fall (2010) semester.

It was suggested that:

- TSC add components to the proposal that could be assessed/measured as far as student learning and related outcomes are concerned. Although all agreed that this initiative has an impact on student engagement, it is not reflected in the current proposal.
- part of this assessment should be designed as part of the individual faculty member's project. Assessment should be determined on an individual case-by-case basis (at least in the beginning)
- the specific technologies in proposal/initiative be targeted more towards coursework itself (as this would be more or less effective in some disciplines)
- students at different colleges compare classroom conditions so this initiative would also affect student morale positively as many are frustrated with where the college is (as far as technology is concerned).

The cost of wiring all classrooms was brought into question. It was clarified that the plan is to upgrade every classroom. J. Rossmeier has given detailed information to T. Knapp and Dr. Dukes regarding the costs and clarified that the plan was to approach the County on a long-term bond for things that last longer than 10 years (e.g. wiring and furniture). Bladen and Marlboro are not on the radar for the immediate future. The current estimated cost is about \$18,000 per room. A. Lex suggested consideration of building training costs into the cost of upgrading the classrooms.

This will be an information item at the next Academic Council meeting.

Council members were asked to consider the following:

- how to prompt faculty interest in learning new classroom technology
- whether the initiative is the best use of \$60,000
- whether faculty members feel this is the best use of \$60,000 for professional development
- the time and cost it would take to train all faculty at the rate set forth in the proposal
- other means of achieving the goals of the TechExpress initiative (e.g. train faculty during Winter or Summer terms or between the end of the semester and graduation in Spring). Training during the semester could post a time management issue due to faculty teaching loads.
- Consider combining capital and operating costs so that they are more closely aligned; look at ways to close budget gaps.
- Whether this plan could be modified to be completed in one semester (versus two)
- The possibility of making it a goal that all faculty who will be moving into the Center for Health Studies receive the training prior to the Center's opening.

M. Hubley will present this issue to the Faculty Senate in their Feb. 4th meeting.

PHIL OF ED DRAFT – N. Plants

Council members paired up and listed 3-4 ideas they believe the Philosophy of Education must include. Those results follow:

- All decisions should be driven by the learning process
- Students share responsibility for learning
- Professors are facilitators
- Interaction between full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty
 - Adjunct faculty members should see themselves reflected in the philosophy of education in order to foster a sense of inclusion
 - Consider the impact on adjunct faculty members

- Engagement (Education should be an engaging experience for all involved.)
- Education should include technology
- Should be a facilitated experience
- Should be for practical as well as creative purposes

- Learning for a career or to become a productive member of society
- Value learning for the sake of learning
- Instill an appreciation/valuation of/for diversity
- Should involve up-to-date instruction and learning methodology

- Facilitate the free exchange of ideas
- Life-long learning
- Provide students and faculty w/ability to think critically (problem solving)
- Expand beyond walls of PGCC into the community

- Rigorous level of instruction
- Student engagement
- High expectations of students
- Faculty engagement
 - Professionally engaged faculty
 - Faculty who are current in their disciplines
- Students who think critically, analyze, and synthesize

- Open access
- Meeting community needs
- Education is a good in and of itself as well as lifelong-learning preparation
- Dynamic not static
 - Transformative process (as well as informative)

Members' preliminary review of the revised Philosophy of Education draft suggested:

- Open access mission of community colleges is not reflected
- Engagement should be emphasized as well

Discussion ensued about the need to keep the Philosophy general enough to serve as an “umbrella” for the upcoming and future vision statement, mission, and strategic plans versus promoting important marketing aspects of the uniqueness of the college. General consensus was that the document would not be grossly different from other community colleges, but that uniqueness (such as very positive student engagement) should be highlighted.

T. Roebuck will send a list of the members’ suggestions to N. Plants who will cluster like items. That document and the revised philosophy from the December 10th meeting will be sent to all members prior to the next meeting. Council members will revisit the draft including ideas generated at this meeting at the January 28th meeting.

Action Items

NONE

Reports

NONE

Questions and Answers

11:50 – 12 Noon Open Discussion – Q&A

There has been concern in the English department with issues related to Quality Matters.

- Faculty members feel they need more training

S. Dunnington asked M. Gavin to discuss the concerns with M. Doss and R. Spells, especially in light of the newly hired instructional designer. If there is not a satisfactory resolution, the issue will be brought to S. Dunnington, and then the Council, if needed.

There has been some discussion of the need to continue reassigned time/compensation for Online Express. It has been suggested that reassign time should be diminished or stopped altogether. **S. Dunnington will make this an agenda item in a future meeting.**

Next Meeting Date and Time: January 28, 2010; 3:00 – 5:00 p.m., CAT 133

- Proposal: Tech Express Follow-Up
- Philosophy of Education
- Faculty Survey
- Secure Classrooms

February 11, 2010

- Hybrid Courses
- Culminating Experiences

- Reassigned Time/Compensation for On-Line Express

The meeting was adjourned at 12 Noon and was followed by lunch.