

Prince George's Community College
Academic Council Meeting
September 9, 2010; 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.; Bladen 110

Members Present: B. Adkins, A. Anderson, B. Brennan, M. Doss, S. Dunnington, M. Gavin, O. Hansen, C. Hoffman, R. Karlsson, A. Lex, E. McLaughlin, N. Plants, B. Sanders, S. Sinex, C. Thomas

Members Absent: A. Mickelson, R. Barshay

Others Present: B. Franklin, M. Hubley, S. Kinslow (for A. Mickelson), B. Reed, T. Roebuck, J. Rosicky (for R. Barshay), R. Swiggett, B. Teal, M. Torain

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved with the added discussion of enrollment numbers.

Approval of Minutes: May 27, 2010

The minutes were approved as circulated.

Enrollment Numbers

S. Dunnington distributed the latest enrollment figures. The final headcount is the highest it has been in more than 25 years (working from a 1984 number, 14,083 headcount). The highest number on record was from 1982, when the headcount was 15,354.

DRAFT – Guiding Principles of Gen Ed – N. Plants

Council members reviewed a revised draft of the Guiding Principles. N. Plants stated that changes from last discussion have been incorporated into the draft.

Council members were informed that the Gen Ed Committee would convene the following week and there would also be a VP Chat the same week regarding gen ed. It was clarified that the Committee would take a final look at the draft; then bring it back to Council one more time for approval. Any additional changes are not expected to be substantive.

The following suggestions were submitted to N. Plants:

- Top paragraph: Revise the following sentence “General education additionally encourages...” to perhaps strike “additionally”

The floor was opened to feedback from Council members and next steps were discussed. It was clarified that the document has not gone to the Faculty Senate. M. Gavin will distribute to the Senate, and S. Dunnington will distribute to the CWF (at the beginning of October) and try to get it onto the next Senior Team agenda with a goal of finalizing the draft at the next Council meeting on September 23rd. It will be placed on the agenda as an action item.

N. Plants will revise the final sentence in the introduction and it will then go to the Chairs meeting for review. In addition, the draft will be emailed to full-time faculty members with a request that wording revisions be sent back. T. Roebuck will compile this feedback.

Changes to Quality Matters Timeline and Exceptions – M. Doss

Background

The procedure for reviewing Quality Matters courses is in need of several updates and revisions. More specifically, the late submission of corrections following the reviews, even when extensions have been given, has become an issue (For example, corrections were to be finished in May, but some were not completed until the end of July or beginning of August). It was clarified that this affects compensation for QM reviewers and strains services the reviewers are able to provide (e.g. overtime etc.). Establishing and sticking with one deadline need to be addressed in the revisions. Additionally, extensions of the time allowed for corrections may allow a course to receive PGCC QM, but that course is not recognized by the national QM. Therefore, the deans agree that extensions should not be given.

M. Doss distributed the document with the following marked changes:

- It was clarified that R. Spells title has changed from Director to Executive Director, eLearning Services.
- The late completion issue was addressed on the last page of the procedures as there was previously no language in the document to address this issue. Firm timelines were suggested.
 - Item A previously read that the course must be revised. Suggested additional language was added in yellow.

The following issues were clarified:

- Reviews were only carried out in Fall and Spring and faculty were notified in October of the Spring reviews.
- Faculty members are made aware that they have six weeks to revise their course and that consultation with reviewers is available.
- Faculty members are made aware of the dates up front, but more structure is needed.
- Payment to reviewers is currently too low and should be increased.
- There will be no Quality Matters reviews this semester due to the upgrade of BlackBoard. Those who have courses scheduled for review will know a semester in advance this time.
- There has been a discussion with deans and administrators regarding the strict adherence to national Quality Matters standards.

The Quality Matters Timeline and Exceptions will go on the agenda as an action at the next Council meeting.

Standardizing Template for Online Courses – M. Doss

Council members revisited the discussion of developing a standardized template (design, structure, etc.) for PGCC online courses (previously on the May agenda). Council members agreed that M. Doss should move forward with establishing a taskforce to design the template. The taskforce will consist of experienced online faculty from each division, M. Doss, and R. Spells. The template should be ready for review by the Council at the end of October or the beginning of November.

Follow-up from AAC&U – S. Dunnington

Council members were informed that PGCC was selected as one of 12 colleges that will participate in the Roadmap Project. As a condition of participation in the project, the following will occur:

- A liaison to the community colleges will link community colleges working on similar issues/initiatives. S. Dunnington has been in contact with the project liaison.
 - 2-3 major initiatives must be chosen as a focus of the Project; then PGCC will be paired with community colleges which have carried out, or are carrying out, like initiatives.
- PGCC will send representatives to the AAC&U meeting in San Francisco in late January.
- There will be a summer institute in which PGCC will be expected to participate.

S. Dunnington will keep Council members apprised of Roadmap Project developments.

PGCC'S Strategic Objectives – A. Lex/S. Dunnington

Council members reviewed a document identifying Academic Affairs Strategic Objectives, Priorities and Partners. The objectives should be completed by June 30, 2011 and progress on each will be color-coded. Council members were asked to consider whether the timelines listed are realistic. It was determined that the following should be revised:

- **A1:**
 - 12-14 criteria have been identified to determine low performing programs
 - It was suggested that it may be possible to convert this information into a rubric where programs will be scored. All programs would be required to use the rubric (It is anticipated that this process would replace program reviews as we know them now).
 - It was determined that the timeline should be revised as follows:
 - ~~November 2010~~ February 2011
 - ~~December 2010~~ March 2011
 - ~~February 2011~~ May 2011

- **A7:**
A discussion began last spring regarding use of technology by faculty. There was some disagreement on whether or not the October 2010 deadline was feasible. It was also suggested that the October, February, and March deadlines are overly optimistic and that College Enrichment day might be a good opportunity to gather data.
 - Gather input from faculty **February 2010**
 - Draft recommendation by **March 2010**
 - Finalize by **May 2010**
- The following rewording (to the objective) was suggested: **Develop a plan for implementing the use of instructional technology by all full time and adjunct faculty and recommend the professional development needed to promote use of that technology.** **A13:** TBD – S. Dunnington distributed the Developmental Education report from 2003 to Council members. In the next meeting B. Reed, M. Torain and B. Teal will present on course completion rates etc. and give updated information.

Academic Council Survey – A. Lex/M. Hubley

Council reviewed a live draft of the Academic Council survey online. A link to the survey will be emailed to all Council members to be piloted. Council members will provide feedback to A. Lex. The survey will then be distributed faculty-wide (unless unforeseen issues arise).

Addressing Developmental Education at PGCC – A. Lex/S. Dunnington

As previously discussed, B. Reed, B. Teal, and M. Torain will be prepared to present at the September 23rd meeting. W. Gardner will also be invited as a resource member to discuss cutoff scores. In the interest of time, this discussion was tabled until the next Council meeting.

Action Item

None

Reports

None

Questions and Answers

Protocol for Classroom Security and Usage

A Council member pointed out that, while the procedures are working well thus far on the third floor of Bladen Hall (e.g. master key distribution, etc.) there are some unforeseen issues to consider. Chief of those issues being that instructors can now close the door but leave it unlocked during class (so that students can get in and out without disrupting class); however, this will not be a possibility when electronic doors replace the current doors unless electronic doors

can remain unlocked during classes. This will pose a problem when late students come in and the door is closed or should students have to step out of the classrooms at any point.

Academic Council and CWF Communication

It was reiterated that if there is anything the Council can do this semester to facilitate open communication with the CWF, it would be helpful. To that end, S. Dunnington will invite CWF co-chairs to the first Council meeting in October.

Next Meeting Date and Time: September 23, 2010

- Developmental Education
- TPACK – Eldon Baldwin
- J. Rossmeier or S. Dunnington will email the Use of Social Media Policy to Council members (discussion item on next agenda)

October 14, 2010

- Update on Textbook Ordering
- Student Behavior
- Assessment Plan and College Enrichment Day
- TBD:
 - Late Registration

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