Meeting: Academic Quality Council
Date/Time: April 20, 2015 – 3:00 p.m.
Locations: Winter Haven Campus – WMS 124
Lakeland Campus – LAC 1243
Recorder: Sarah Plazak
Attending Members: Patricia Jones, April Robinson, Donald Painter, Sally Fitzgerald,
Rebecka Sare, Ben Gracy, Kaye Betz, Li Zhou (in place of Greg Toole),
Laurel Smith, Lisa Smelser, Lorrie Jones, Beth Luckett, Herb Nold,
Mackenzie Jennings
Attending Resource Members: Kenneth Ross, David Albrecht, and Chris Fullerton
Other Faculty/Staff: Kevin Ferrier, Holly Scoggins

Welcome
Patricia welcomed everyone at 3:03 pm. A quorum was never reached due to the absence of the
Advising Representatives. It was suggested that all proposals be approved pending review by Student
Services. All approved this plan.

I. Approval of Minutes from March 16, 2015:

Laurel Smith made a motion to approve the meeting minutes; Li Zhou seconded. No further discussion;
motion passed unanimously.

II. Course Modification: ART 1511C Landscape Painting
Presenters: Holly Scoggins

Holly Scoggins stated that it is being proposed to change the course description of ART 1511C
Landscape Painting. The current course description states that it is an alla prima course, meaning that
students paint outside; however, because weather does not always permit painting to take place
outside, it is proposed that the wording be changed to “indirect studio painting,” which means it would
use different techniques. Also, the new course description includes painting from photography. These
changes in wording would make the course description more expansive.

Laurel Smith made a motion to approve; Mackenzie Jennings seconded. No further discussion; motion
passed unanimously.

III. Course Modification: ART 2555C Portrait Painting
Presenters: Holly Scoggins

Holly Scoggins proposed expanding the course description for ART 2555C Portrait Painting. Currently,
the course description limits techniques to chiaroscuro. The proposed course description would add
composition, anatomy, proportions, and more color mixing to broaden the description.

Lorries Jones made a motion to approve; Lisa Smelser seconded. No further discussion; motion
passed unanimously.
IV. Course Modification: MAN 4504 *Operational Decision Making*

**Presenters:** Herb Nold on behalf of Maria Lehoczky

Herb Nold proposed that QMB 3600 *Quantitative Methods in Business* be made a prerequisite for MAN 4504 *Operational Decision Making*. Currently, the focus in MAN 4504 is on analyzing and interpreting data and then deciding what management action should be taken based on that data. A problem has been encountered because students who are either taking the two courses at the same time or who have not taken QMB 3600 yet need faculty to spend time going over material that the students should already know, which takes away from the time spent interpreting the data and coming up with management decisions. The faculty who teach the two courses have discussed this proposed change and are supportive.

Lorrie Jones asked how the proposed change would affect student’s schedules, and if it would lengthen the program. Donald Painter answered, stating that it would not lengthen the program, but it would require students to follow the sequence that was always intended.

Kenneth Ross asked if there are enough sections of QMB 3600 to handle this as a prerequisite or if it would cause a shift in enrollment pattern. Donald Painter answered that QMB 3600 is already a program requirement, but now students would be required to take it prior to enrolling in MAN 4504. It would shift when students take the course, but it would not shift the numbers.

Kaye Betz made a motion to approve; Sally Fitzgerald seconded. No further discussion; motion passed unanimously.

V. Program Modification: Cardiovascular Technology Advanced Technical Certificate

**Presenter:** Kevin Ferrier

Kevin Ferrier said he is proposing two changes to the Cardiovascular Technology Advanced Technology Certificate. One, CVT 1800L *Cardiovascular Pre-Practicum* would be added to the program, which would allow the increase of clinical hours by 184 hours. Based on feedback from preceptors, this would prepare students better to enter this accelerated field. In addition, currently the program only requires 800 hours, which is the bare minimum that students need to sit for the registry. It is proposed to increase that number by nearly 200 hours to allow the students a little bit of leeway in how many hours they accrue before sitting for the credentialing exam. The second change is to extend the program from three to four terms to accommodate the pre-practicum. This would serve the purpose of keeping the two-year track in sequence with the accelerated track. Since this is a limited admission program, the classes are only offered once a year.

Sally Fitzgerald asked if there are enough clinical sites to add these hours. Kevin responded that yes, the college currently has seventeen clinic sites, fifteen hospitals, and two out-patient cardiac cath labs, and the department is talking to two additional sites to add.

Kenneth Ross stated that last year the Nursing department was required to show how a student could get done in two years, and he asked if lengthening the Cardiovascular program would have any impact on the program’s accreditation. Kevin answered that it would not, because there is no talk in the two-year program about shortening the program or limiting the credit hours.

Beth Luckett made a motion to approve; Kaye Betz seconded. No further discussion; motion passed unanimously.
VI. – X. Digital Media Changes  
Presenter: Donald Painter on behalf of Gregory Johnson

Donald Painter presented the modifications to the Digital Media, AS degree and each of the program’s three certificates, which also include course modifications and new courses. The changes are a result of feedback received from the Advising Committee regarding how the program prepares students to enter the work world. Based on this feedback, the changes proposed would involve removing some courses from the core and adding some courses to the three specializations. This change would allow additional specialization courses in both the Web Production and Graphic Design specializations. These specializations are needed so that students would feel comfortable with their skills and have the correct knowledge and information to demonstrate it at the end of the program. In order to make these changes to the program and specialization, there are also many prerequisite changes that add prerequisites to courses. Part of what the College is trying to do is ensure a certain progression through the program, and the College is trying to accomplish this with prerequisites so that when students get into some of the advanced specialization courses, they have the core knowledge that would allow them to be successful. From a tactical/operational standpoint to ensure that this proposed change does not keep students from progressing, the faculty is developing a yearly schedule that would be published on the website, and it would have corresponding progression plans that go with it to show students how they should progress through the program.

Ben Gracy asked about the wording of the course description for COP 2801 JavaScript Fundamentals. He was concerned about the meaning of the word jQuery, stating that according to Wikipedia, “jQuery is a cross-platform JavaScript library.” Also, the statement at the end of the course description seems to be repeating what was previously stated in the description, so he felt that these two areas of wording were redundant. Donald Painter acknowledged the redundancy and said that the wording could be tweaked, but he could only speak to the bigger picture. That particular wording has always been a challenge. The College is trying to not lock-down to a specific language because the advisory committees have indicated that the terms shift. So, JavaScript may be the term today, but there may be another scripting language that is closely related that comes along as a variant that students need to know. The College is trying to keep the wording broad enough to avoid coming back and changing the course description. Donald suggested that the course description could be edited to “JavaScript and other scripting languages” and delete the last sentence.

Kenneth Ross asked if this would compete with any of Cliff’s courses or if these are unique courses. Donald said that the Digital Media courses are a different area because Cliff’s courses focus on networking and hardware. Kenneth Ross also pointed out some redundancy in the course description of CGS 2822C Intermediate Web Development, and he suggested changing the wording from “including” to “such as.” Donald said that the Advisory Board had also had concern about that wording because they wished to list specific languages/tools they wanted covered. Kenneth Ross said that the College will need to make sure that the software being taught is current and up-to-date.

Kaye Betz said that we offer some Digital Media classes on the high school campuses, and she asked if any of these are the same as the ones that are being modified. Donald said the College negotiated with the high schools approximately six courses they would be allowed to teach as dual enrollment. All of these courses were part of the core. Donald said the College would need to revisit the negotiations. The College attempts to adhere to the basics of the core on the high school campuses. These changes will have an impact on the high school courses, but the College is more than committed to offering an appropriate two-year sequence in the high schools that have digital media academies.

Lisa Smelser asked how removing MMC 1000 Communications and the Mass Media and MAR 2011 Principles of Marketing from this program would impact these courses. Donald said that MMC 1000 has mainly been taught by adjuncts because full-time faculty did not show an interest in teaching it. There are some students who take that course as an AA elective, so the course will still be offered, but the number of sections will be reduced. This will not create a problem since this course is adjunct-taught. Donald did not believe that MAR 2011 would not be impacted because it is used primarily in the Business area, who were consulted about this change.
Rebecka Sare made a motion to table these proposals; Lorrie Jones seconded. No discussion; motion passed with Kaye Betz voting to oppose.

XI. General Education Committee Discussion

Presenter: Ken Ross

Kenneth Ross said that an official General Education Committee had been created, as opposed to the ad hoc committee that reviewed items as they arose. An issue was discovered when the approval process was analyzed, and it was noted that there was no technical General Education Committee; instead, AQC would decide if something was a general education course. There was no external group reviewing whether or not it should be a general education course. The idea was to create a committee that would review the courses against the general education requirements. The AQC Committee would approve for a course, but the General Education Committee would need to recommend to AQC whether or not that course could be a general education course. This would provide the checks-and-balances that the accrediting agency (SACS) requires. The idea was that the AQC Committee would be the keeper of the curriculum, and the General Education Committee would send items forward as appropriate for the general education areas.

Patricia Jones discussed the process of how the new committee would work. Currently, someone submits a course, it goes to Patricia’s office, it goes to the Program Director, and then it goes to AQC. Patricia asked if the Committee felt like the process should be stopped somewhere in that sequence to be reviewed by the General Education Committee. For example, would it be best if the course diverted to the General Education Committee when it reached the step of the Program Director. Kenneth said that he is looking at the General Education Committee as an ad hoc meeting rather than a monthly meeting, and he hopes that the General Education Committee would meet before the AQC meeting. Patricia asked what documents the Committee would need to review, and Kenneth said that the BCI would be sufficient. The proposal would not be necessary. The General Education Committee would focus on looking at SACS criteria, Department of Education Criteria, and course outcomes. Kenneth said that he is open to any process that does not stall the approval process. The course could go to General Education Committee before or during the AQC proposal process. Kenneth did not think that the Committee would need to meet very often because there are not many new general education courses. Kenneth said that he would like the General Education Committee to see the proposal before the AQC meeting. Lorrie Jones agreed, saying that the General Education Committee might need to do some tweaking, which would result in the need for AQC approval. Kenneth said he did not want the AQC Committee to feel that they had to approve a course simply because the General Education Committee had approved it. The General Education Committee would decide if the course met the criteria, but the AQC Committee would decide whether or not it should be a course. Rebecka Sare stated that the General Education Committee’s scope would need to be kept narrow enough that they would simply be deciding yes or no about the general education criteria alone. Kenneth said that this procedure would be added to Procedure 6002, so he would need to take it to Senate. He said that Nelson Marquez had suggested that the General Education Committee be a standing committee, and the President’s Staff Committee was in agreement, so if approved, it would continue through the process.

Kaye Betz was concerned about the purpose statement of the General Education Committee, as if it implied the review of all courses currently being offered. Also, she had concerns about the “ad hoc” wording, believing that either a committee was standing or ad hoc. Patricia asked if Kaye felt that “ad hoc” should be removed from the wording. Kenneth and Lorries Jones said that the wording had been discussed at the General Education Committee meeting. Kenneth said that the goal of the committee is not to go through every existing course because that had already been done. This committee would be only for new courses. Kenneth said that he would need to check and see if the District Board of Trustees needed to be included, but he thought it might be a SACS requirement. He said that when SACS evaluates the College again, they will ask to be shown the process we use, and they usually do not question the process.
Kaye asked if Patricia would be a voting member of the General Education Committee, and Kenneth confirmed. Kenneth said that he would be the liaison from President’s Staff.

Patricia asked if there were any amendments to the text before voting. Kaye said that she was not sure why the “ad hoc” wording needed to remain, but Kenneth said it needed to stay because it would not be a standing committee with regular meetings. It would strictly be an advisory committee for the AQC Committee. There were no amendments made.

Herb Nold made a motion to approve; Laurel Smith seconded. No further discussion; motion passed unanimously.

XII. New Curriculog Proposals Forms
Presenter: Patricia Jones

Patricia Jones stated that currently if someone wishes to end term a course or a program, a course modification form or a program modification form must be used. The end term box is checked, but the majority of the proposal is to be ignored, which gets a little confusing for faculty and often results in unnecessary work on their part. To simplify things, two new forms were developed just for the purpose of end terming a course or a program. These forms are very short, requiring just filling in the name of the program (or course) and its CIP code (when applicable), checking the end term box, and explaining why this action is necessary and who the action would impact. Other than that, there are no other fields that would be found on the course modification or program modification forms.

There were no questions or concerns about these new forms. Patricia said that the AQC Handbook would now be updated so the forms would be available as faculty need them.

XIII. AA Review Discussion
Presenter: Patricia Jones

The College has a five-year cycle to review AA courses, so each year, each department reviews approximately one fifth of its courses. A table of courses was provided with the results of the departments’ decisions. The College is on year four of the five-year cycle.

Lorrie Jones made a motion to approve; Laurel Smith seconded. No further discussion; motion passed unanimously.

Lorrie Jones made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned: 3:50 pm.

NOTE:
Approval of all decisions made during the AQC meeting on April 20, 2015 was received from Terrence Hays and Carolina Rodriguez (Student Services Representatives) on April 23, 2015, thereby addressing the issue of quorum.