

Prince George's Community College
Academic Council Meeting
Feb. 10, 2011; 3:00 – 5:00 pm, CAT 133

Members Present: A Anderson, B. Adkins, M. Doss, B. Brennan, J. Calhoun, S. Dunnington, L. Ellsworth, M. Gavin, O. Hansen, C. Hoffman, R. Karlsson, M. Kramer, A. Lex, A. Mickelson, N. Plants, B. Sanders, S. Sinex, C. Thomas

Members Absent: None

Others Present: E. Baldwin, T. Roebuck

Approval of Minutes: December 13, 2010

The minutes were approved as circulated.

Information/Discussion Items

Review of Academic Affairs' FY11 Strategic Objectives – M. Doss/A. Anderson

The agenda was adjusted regarding discussion of the Strategic Objectives. Instead, the objectives were interspersed among agenda information/discussion items.

Update on General Education Committee's Work – N. Plants

One of the issues the committee faced was when the Gen Ed Committee was asked to come up with the CLOs, and to only come up with outcomes that would apply to any course across the institution (not just gen ed). Thus, the outcomes don't apply only to gen ed courses; but to all courses. What the committee is doing now is coming up with characteristics of general education courses that accord with the CLOs. The committee is taking a two-pronged approach to this task:

- Come up with general criteria
- Come up with criteria specific to the 6 Academic Areas

Strategic Objectives

A2 – Identify essential Core Learning Outcomes to be met by courses in each general education category and revise courses for compliance

- Items 3 and 4 are in progress.
- It was suggested that there is a need to determine what is “essential” as far as CLOs are concerned.
- Criteria are needed before the committee can address items 4 and 5
- Although the timeline is this semester, number 5 likely cannot be met until May.

There was some discussion of anticipated issues with the Completion Agenda (concerning when students take certain courses at particular points in their academic career) e.g. certain courses should be taken early on.

Addressing the Strategic Objective related to Technology: Setting Direction to Achieve Objective – M. Gavin/M. Doss

M. Doss distributed an update on the Strategic Plan and FY11 Objectives from Dr. Dukes and explained the color key of the spreadsheet:

Green: On track to be completed by June 30, 2011

Yellow: In Progress/on track

Blue: Objective completed

Red: May not be completed by June 30, 2011

Council reviewed its progress relative to the strategic objectives:

- Discussed *Confirm dual enrollment agreements* (December 2010) *page 2*
A meeting with PGCPS will be scheduled to continue this discussion and confirm dual enrollment agreements.
- It was clarified that The Environmental Science Program would go to the Board that evening *page 4*
- Council was informed that the online course development (red) initiative is not being funded this fiscal year and no one else in course development will be hired. *Page 4*
- It was noted that item 1, *page 5* was to be done in October 2010, but is now anticipated to be completed in February as this should currently be in the data gathering phase
 - It was questioned whether there has been any discussion in recent meetings on this initiative. It was clarified that there is an effort that is already underway.
 - Regarding item 2, Council discussed the technology steering committee, TPACK proposal, etc. The status of item 2 is undetermined as the committee has not met recently. *S. Sinex will send the technology steering committee documents to T. Roebuck for distribution to Council members.*

Late Registration Issues – A. Anderson/C. Hoffman

- **Next Steps**

It was suggested that following the late registration policy as it stands did not always work due to the following:

- inclement weather
- the last late drop for non-payment
- faculty are not paying close attention to their rosters and thus letting people sit in classes who have been dropped for nonpayment
- if you owe a little over \$100, you are dropped for nonpayment)

- There was discussion of Anne Arundel Community College's policy which allows students to pay \$100 up front to remain in their classes and be put on a payment plan.

V. Bagley indicated that the number of late registrations appeared to have gone down.

It was clarified that there does not appear to be an issue with delay on Financial Aid's end, as they did a remarkable job turning the award letters around. The letter will be revised to clarify for which semester the funds are available to students.

Next Steps include resolving those issues that would eliminate the aforementioned problems. It was questioned why the drop occurs the week classes begin. Council members agreed that the understanding was that the drop wasn't going to happen. It was also questioned whether PGCC is moving at all towards a payment system where students have an entire semester to pay (much like the traditional payment system at other colleges) as this would resolve many of the issues.

Additionally, it was pointed out that we are now into the third week of classes and there are a lot of students not being counted; this affects our FTEs.

It was suggested that a formal statement including some of the following recommendations be presented to S. Forman:

Financial Aid Issues

- Consider how students pay for courses (their available funding etc.)
- Consider revising the policy of dropping students owing a little over \$100

Faculty Issues

- Faculty must check their rosters
(It was pointed out that OwlLink has glitches; e.g. It was down for hours on the first day of registration.)

Colleague Issues

- It has been questioned why Deans and Chairs don't have Colleague rights as that would make the process more efficient.
- It was questioned why the waitlist is not automatic like it is at other colleges? Is it impossible?
- It was pointed out that part of the problem is with students not using their student email. Students also need to check their spam folder.

Additional suggestions included the issue with faculty not checking their rosters should go into the faculty handbook.

M. Gavin will take the \$100 nonpayment issue to the student ERP team and see if we can have guests attend the next AC meeting to address the issues.

Results of AC Survey – A. Lex (*see attached*)

- Implications and Next Steps

Implications of the AC effectiveness survey:

- There does not seem to be a clear understanding of what the AC is, what it's supposed to do, how it relates to other groups/committees/initiatives, or who the representative is.
- There is still an issue of where the AC fits in with the college governance structure (as it is not written anywhere).
 - This is something that should be done before Middle States comes.
 - It was suggested that it's a possibility that this is a general issue with all committees. Perhaps the campus community does not have a clear understanding of governance or where all of the committees fit in (Faculty Organization, CWF, AC, etc.)

It was reiterated that we were cited for governance issues before and this survey suggests that some of those problems still persist. It was suggested that the governance groups should meet to discuss a governance structure.

It was clarified that the lack of response to surveys remains an issue.

Strategic Objectives

The efficacy of the AC is addressed on page 6 of the survey.

Update on Steps for Developmental Education – M. Gavin

Last semester, the committee spent a great deal of time on dev ed. The dev ed committee will report back to the Council and will tie their goals into completion.

Strategic Objectives

DevEd relates to the last objective on *page 8 (Plan of action for future direction)*. It does not look like we're on the same track.

It was suggested that items 2 and 4 should be re-examined.

It was clarified that that when the AC was asked to look at the 2003 dev ed report, everyone was clear that they were on the right track in terms of the recommendations made in that report. The problem wasn't a lack of viable recommendations, rather a lack of follow-through.

Update on Completion Agenda – M. Gavin/A. Anderson

The President reconvened the group assigned to the Completion agenda approximately two weeks ago for a debriefing (as it was postponed before the break). The following issues were discussed:

- An attempt will be made to include sequencing in the catalog as it was determined that students tend to do better when given a prescriptive model.
- Exploring other avenues for developmental students
- Still seeking clarification as far as what is considered completion (eg – can we count WDCE students' goals?)
 - Completion is either the student graduates with a certificate or degree; or if their goal is to transfer, they do.
 - It was questioned how transfers would be counted.
 - There was some discussion of automatically awarding students certificates if they completed the requirements, whether they intended to or not. (Montgomery College was offered as an example of one college which does this.)
 - It was questioned whether this would be accepted at a federal level.
- Making improvements to space planning (when undergoing renovations etc.)
 - Facilitating a more user-friendly process

It was clarified that there will be a number of initiatives that should come through either the completion committee or the AC. AC members were invited to bring suggestions to the next meeting.

Action Items

Reports – NONE

Questions and Answers

Next Meeting: February 24, 2011

- Link to data from the technology committee
- Discussion with Student ERP Committee
- Developmental Education follow-up (including exit of students)
 - Include discussion of ESL

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