

**Prince George's Community College  
Academic Council Meeting  
March. 24, 2011; 3:00 – 5:00 pm, CAT133**

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

**Members Absent:** B. Adkins, J. Calhoun

**Others Present:** I. Antoons, V. Bagley, E. Baldwin, A. Richman, T. Roebuck

**The Council members welcomed Michael Harley, the new student rep to the Council.**

**Approval of Agenda:**

The agenda approved as circulated

**Approval of Minutes: March 10, 2011**

Minutes were approved with the following correction:

**Next Meeting: March 10 24, 2011, 3 to 5 p.m.**

- Technology in the Classroom
- Completion Agenda

**Information/Discussion Items**

**Update on General Education Revisions – N. Plants**

**Background**

In 1996, there was a document identifying what criteria Maryland Community College's must meet in our gen ed courses in order for them to be accepted at four-year, in-state institutions. To that end, the gen ed committee is working on a process to ensure we are meeting those criteria. In order to more fully define what a PGCC general education course consists in, the gen ed committee has been crafting both a general definition and even more specific criteria for each of the six general education areas. N. Plants distributed the most recent draft of the committee's general definition.

In addition to this document, there are the guiding principles which were approved last semester. The guiding principles will be combined with the final iteration of the draft distributed today and the more specific criteria to form a general education packet that will guide gen ed decisions.

**Next Steps:**

1-At the start of the fall 2011 semester, department chairs will receive a packet with the final documents and criteria to assist in identifying and volunteering pulling courses on the gen ed list that should not be there.

2-Once completed, the Gen Ed Committee will recommend ending the moratorium on granting gen ed status to other courses.

3-The next step will be to initiate the process of confirming any remaining courses on the gen ed list as meeting the new standards.

4- Will give criteria to departments and ask them to voluntarily pull courses that don't meet the guidelines/criteria

If the departments are unable to answer questions 1 and 2 of the draft definition in the affirmative, then the answer is clear cut—the course is not an instance of general education. Council will get a more complete packet later (to be introduced to the chairs Council at their first meeting in the Fall).

#### **FY11 Strategic Plan: Updating Progress – All**

Per previous discussions, all initiatives/goals marked with green are on target and will be done by June 30th. Those marked with blue have been completed. Yellow items are lagging but should be completed by June 30, 2011; and Red items will not be completed.

#### Yellow from last review

A3(2) - Confirm dual enrollment agreements (December 2010) – work is continuing, stay yellow

A4c(3) - Obtain Board of Trustees approval (November 2010) – completed/blue

A4c(4) - Submit documents to MHEC (November 2010) – completed/blue

A11(4) - Submit updated plans to VPAA (Dean) (November 2010) – completed/blue

#### ***Council was asked to consider what can be done to get these goals achieved by end of semester:***

A7(1) - Identify level of support Technology Services can offer for increased use of learning technologies in all courses for any proposals (October 2010)

A7(2) - Complete data gathering from faculty regarding instructional technology needs (February 2011)

***TPACK has started (with 8 people) some planning to start training as early as Spring Break. See next section of minutes for additional discussion.***

#### Red

A5(1) - Define the need for faculty support requirements for online course development (October 2010)

A5(2) - Hire necessary resource staff for faculty (January 2011)

***These goals will not be met due to insufficient funding. However they will be funded in the 2012 budget.***

#### Green

A9(5) - (regarding reporting results on the efficacy of the Academic Council to the Faculty Senate) has not been completed. – Make this yellow.

***M. Gavin will ask the Faculty Senate for suggestions about improving campus-wide awareness of the Council and its function(s).***

**A13** - Reevaluate all aspects of developmental education and make recommendations for enhancing developmental programs that include how to best meet the needs of severely under-prepared students. -- Green

*Our plan of action includes the recommendation on floor scores which was recently sent to the president as well as whatever we decide to put into place this Fall regarding sequencing.*

**Technology in the Classroom: Addressing Needs and Use - All**

Per past survey data, there are a variety of technology tools available across departments. TPACK (which has started) might help; however many faculty have found training via other means.

There was some concern that some buildings have advanced technology while others still do not (still no sense of a tech refresh plan). Thus access to available technology (and training faculty on technology they may not have the opportunity to use) is still an issue. It was suggested that part of the plan would be to phase in implementation of technology. A technology fee was also suggested as this has been used at other colleges to purchase equipment, software, etc. for the classrooms.

*O. Hansen will work with a small group to work on the following (to be ready in draft form to Council the first meeting in May):*

*- A plan and training goals which will subsequently be priced out*

*-An audit of what faculty need in the classroom*

*-what type of professional development faculty need (as far as training on software and hardware)*

*Group members will include: M. Kramer, C. Thomas, M. Doss, C. Hoffman, and A. Richman*

It was suggested that one place to mine information would be course assessments which would have data attached on how courses could be improved (responses provided by faculty).

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan – A. Richman/B. Brennan/ I. Antoons**

(see assessment plan packet and Scalability document)

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan was developed by the Academic Affairs Assessment Committee with an objective of having a plan approved by the end of the semester. It will be piloted in the Fall.

A committee is currently working on software selection. Council representatives on the committee include S. Sinex, A. Anderson, A. Lex, B. Brennan, and S. Dunnington. \$150,000 has already been budgeted for this for next year. The committee's first step will be to discuss the software with schools which are currently using those products. The committee is finalizing a rubric to rate the products as they try them. This plan, however, cannot be implemented without the software.

There was some concern (see page 7) that adjunct representation is needed. It was clarified that this plan does not exclude adjunct faculty. It was suggested that the document be revised to clarify that adjuncts must be included on the Assessment committee.

The plan was designed such that it could be scalable based on requirements/should requirements change. It was clarified that this plan was developed in response to a specific request from MHEC in 2002. Language regarding moving towards direct measures was added in 2005. Some language in the current document was revised to note that the recommendation was to go after high occupancy courses in order to get a good sampling of students covering all of the CLOs and program outcomes.

In terms of exactly how much the plan will require (how many sections, how many courses, etc) is still open to discussion. Some courses will be selected for piloting in the Fall. It was clarified that the document is purposely vague about how much assessment would be done so that it could be adjusted depending on the requirements.

As noted via tracked changes, there have been multiple wording changes throughout the document to accurately reflect what was intended. More tightening may still be needed. The main idea is that we have to have direct measurements from students, which would be entered by faculty. This process would be overseen by DATs.

It was suggested that a table or glossary of acronyms be added to the document.

It was clarified that, since DATs are faculty, it would be up to departmental chairs whether their participation would be considered departmental service (see page 8: “each division is responsible for establishing procedures...”). Tracking of hours should take place during the pilot so that we get a solid measurement of how many hours the process takes and what a reasonable compensation would be. It must be understood, however, that there is no guarantee that this is the way it will work. Instead, we may just have to add more DATs to keep the workload manageable. Compensation is not up for discussion at the moment as assessment is an expected initiative in which faculty should participate. In addition, concern was expressed regarding the scope and timeline, particularly where gen ed courses are concerned. Council members agreed, however, that a larger scope will capture student data more accurately, as it is better to capture data in high enrollment classes. Initially, classes with high enrollment will be the focus. Additionally, there is no timeline at this point as it is unclear exactly how long the process will take until the pilot is complete. Afterwards, there will be a specific timeline.

***This will come back as an action item at the next meeting as having a working plan in place by the end of Spring semester is a part of the strategic plan. Council will vote on the process and share thoughts on how to approach professional development/training. Some semblance of a rollout plan, professional development information, and acronym glossary will be presented at the next Council meeting.***

### **The Completion Agenda – All**

- Follow up to practices surrounding Developmental Courses
  - (bring handout from last meeting – also attached) “dev policies data”
  - Next Steps

Council members agreed that it is critical that students complete dev ed courses as soon as possible (early on in their enrollment). It was also agreed that students should be required to follow their sequence. ***Barring issues with financial aid requirements and time blocks, it was agreed that at least one of the dev ed English/Reading courses should be completed in the first semester, and dev ed math should be completed by 15 billable hours.***

There was some discussion as to whether or not dev ed math classes should be offered in conjunction with other courses at all, or in summer session at all (as the compressed schedule may be an issue.) It was clarified that, unless there are data indicating that students do better under certain circumstances, we cannot make random recommendations to students about how or when they should take classes. ***OPAIR will look at drop and failure rates for dev ed math classes in summer session as well as the difference between those taken in 5-week, 8-week, and 10-week sessions. Council will review the data before deciding on next steps.***

- Requiring “gatekeeper” courses are taken in certain percentage of credits/certain number of courses, etc. – **A. Richman**
  - What are key gatekeeper courses?
  - What are initial procedures to put in place? Secondary or later one?
  - Next steps

Council briefly discussed their thoughts on “gatekeeper courses” before receiving a handout with specific definitions of gatekeepers courses. It was clarified that only two area community colleges (Carroll and Cecil) appear to have requirements in place for taking gatekeeper courses within a designated timeframe. (see *gatekeeper1.pdf*). Data was also provided on success rates in gatekeepers at PGCC taken in the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 semesters (see *gatekeeper2.pdf*). Council will discuss data on course success rates further at the next meeting.

### **Action Items**

**Reports** - NONE

### **Questions and Answers**

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

- Academic Governance
- Completion Issues

**The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm**