

Prince George's Community College
Academic Council Meeting
March. 10, 2011; 3:00 – 5:00 pm, CAT133

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

Members Absent: A. Anderson, B. Adkins, M. Doss, C. Thomas

Others Present: V. Bagley, T. Roebuck, E. Robbins, C. Gossage, A. Richman, B. Johnson

Approval of Agenda:

The agenda approved as circulated, with the addition of approving the wording regarding the purpose of Intersession courses.

Approval of Minutes: February 24, 2011

Correction:

Page 2 under “Review of Decision: Due Dates for Grades”, 2nd paragraph:

∅ **Due** to

Page 4 under “The Completion Agenda”, 1st paragraph:

Dec. 3, 2010 (date of campus completion meeting)

Information/Discussion Items

Late Registration Data from Spring 2011 – V. Bagley

Background

There were 930 late registration forms processed in Fall 2010 and over 1140 so far this year. It was clarified that the majority of late registrations came in the second to third week, possibly due to snow days and to the drop that did not occur until into the second week. Per the catalog, there is a late registration fee of \$30. However, this penalty has not been implemented as of late.

Suggestions

- Implement the late registration fee (as noted in the catalog)
 - **S. Dunnington will take this and the other suggestions to the Sr. Team Council.**
- Work with Student Services on a campaign to impress upon students the importance of the first day to possibly include:
 - posted signs the week of registration about the importance of the first day of class;
 - handouts for students
- Have faculty make a first day discussion at the end of the semester

Intersession Courses: Suggested Wording

Council was asked for feedback on discussed circulated draft statement regarding intersession courses. It was clarified that this would go into the print schedule and possibly the catalog.

Council agreed that the draft statement captures the intent of the discussion at the last meeting and should go forward. M. Kramer will edit the statement and send it to V. Bagley and S. Dunnington.

Academic Governance: Continued Discussion – M. Gavin (see diagram)

M. Gavin distributed a revised draft governance chart to Council, pointing out that the two audiences in mind would be those who serve on the committees and those who have not served on any committees.

Minor corrections were suggested by Council. It was suggested that the diagram is arranged in such a way that would suggest that the CWF does not report to the President; it should be corrected to show that the CWF does in fact report to the President.

Clarification was requested on the structure of the diagram (eg: Are boxes next to each other an indication of groups on the same level, or is this merely a design to fit the page?). It was explained that the diagram is not structured in terms of levels of power per se, but process.

The following suggestions were offered:

- Add a description of the various committees and what they do, and attach a separate document containing sample scenarios; a document illustrating steps to take in various situations (that may help clarify the issue of power vs. process as well)
- The diagram should go on the website and/or portal

T. Roebuck will discuss developing an AC Portal page with M. Kane-Morris

Members of the Academic Council will distribute the descriptions to the constituencies they represent for revision and go from there. The diagram will be back on the agenda in April.

Pilot: Program Review Process – A. Anderson/C. Hoffman

Background

Per a previous discussion on new means of assessing productivity, Council reviewed the proposed program review process pilot (and previous model). Per the strategic plan, the new review process was to be developed by the Academic Team. It was clarified that we are currently on schedule with the new review process which was planned to be implemented in March and April. A timeline extension will likely be proposed today, but it cannot be postponed another semester.

The previous review process was implemented in 2007. In the long run, we were not getting useful information and individuals were not objectively looking at how programs could be improved upon. Rather, they were justifying their existence. Thus, it was determined that we needed to revise the process to make it more concise and focused on improvement. After a careful review of how other colleges approach this process, it became clear that we could not have a document consisting of narrative only. A rubric must be included. The result is the suggested revised program review in which a pilot will be conducted in Spring 2011 with 8 programs from the four divisions that include academic programs (Learning Foundations is not included).

Members of the Academic Team and OPAIR worked together on the suggested rubric and timeline for doing the reviews. It was clarified that this document is a work in progress and the chairs involved will have an opportunity to discuss what worked, and vice versa, afterwards. Further, it was decided that there will be more time allowed to complete the reviews than previously thought.

Chairs have expressed concern that they had little to no input and that the divisions involved need the necessary data as soon as possible to complete the review. It was clarified that this is a working document which was distributed as soon as it was available, and several of the programs already have their data and that the turnaround time for data is short. It was reiterated that this is a pilot and chairs are welcome to make changes, based on evidence, after the initial pilot in spring 2011. Further, the strategic plan was very clear that chairs would get it by February to be piloted in March and April. Departments will now have until June to complete the review and will be involved in whatever revisions come out of this process (to be finalized in no later than the first of October for the fall 2011 reviews).

Council was asked to choose between the old and new review format.

Questions:

Who will be responsible for reviewing?

The chair and dean will discuss the review. The dean will forward the completed review to all academic team members. At a joint meeting with the chair and academic team the review will be discussed and additional resources identified. At that point, it will become a working document for the next four years. An interim report will be submitted midway through the cycle addressing progress in noted areas of concern

Will programs be cut based on this?

The short answer is no as the program review serves the purpose of getting everyone focused on what is needed to move programs forward. It is not meant to be punitive. Programs would only be cut under dire circumstances, given the current state of the economy. If the College comes to a point where that is absolutely necessary, however, a new program review would be done at that time. It would not be based on the review done this year.

Looking at the numbers of majors, there was some concern that this is an undertaking for a four-year college (not a community college). It was clarified that we do have career and technical programs to which it applies. Further the State requires that we produce proof that we are working on low-producing programs. However, it is possible that the enrollment numbers in the rubric need to differ for general studies options. If that is determined, revisions will be made.

Council agreed to move forward with the new version. Eight chairs will be charged to work with the Chairs Council and committee from the Academic Team that developed the document to come up with recommendations for revisions based on the outcome. There is currently no timeline in place for ongoing reviews as S. Dunnington will discuss this at the Chairs Council meeting on Monday.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan: Overview – A. Richman

A. Richman distributed a primer on the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and clarified that the chairs have already seen the document, and it is scheduled to go to the Faculty Senate the week of March 14th. It will then be returned to the Academic Affairs Assessment Committee for revisions, based on feedback received.

The document addressed the following:

- What must be measured (CLOs, program and course outcomes, improvement)
- Cycle of assessment
- Timeline/Rate
- Number of students (The small spot checking/random sampling of 2-3% of students is not going to cut it. A random sampling of 10-15% at least has been given as an acceptable starting point)
- Goals
- Oversight
- How to implement the changes

Regarding data assessment teams (DATs), it was clarified that smaller departments will have the option of partnering with other departments as needed.

The Completion Agenda – All

- *Requiring “gatekeeper” courses are taken in certain percentage of credits/certain number of courses, etc.* – A. Richman

Council revisited the discussion of what others are doing regarding developmental policies (see devpolicydata.pdf). Of the 16 community colleges in Maryland, 11 of them have been examined by OPAIR so far, using each institution’s current catalog, student handbook, and website for reference. Many institutions do not publicly provide specifics about their developmental programs.

Based on their research, it was found that the majority of institutions have a range of restrictions (e.g., exactly when a student must enroll, limits on maximum semester course-load, etc.) for students designated as developmental. Further, all institutions using a floor score had continuing education requirements that were the gateway to academic developmental coursework.

Evidence was also found which indicates that continuous enrollment is beneficial to such students (as those who are not enrolled continuously have not fared well).

It was clarified that OPAIR also has data on the progress of developmental students at other schools who took continuing education courses when they failed to meet the floor score for the credit side. J. Martinelli and D. Lyon are currently looking into what other schools offer on the continuing education side.

Action Items

Reports - NONE

Questions and Answers

Next Meeting: March 24, 2011, 3 to 5 p.m.

- Technology in the Classroom
- Completion Agenda
- Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan
- Gen ed update??

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm