

### *Minutes*

FYE/Academic Success Department Meeting  
August 19, 2013 5:30-7:30 p.m. in Q-128

	Present	Absent	Excused		Present	Absent	Excused
Eileen DeLuca	X			Wanda Day	X		
Martin Tawil	X			Joyce Dye			X
Kelly Newhouse	X			Sam Thomas	X		
Kathy Clark	X			Marcus Jenkins			X
Mary Vaughn	X			Cindy Ewald	X		
Freida Miller	X			Michael Granata	X		
Cindy Campbell	X			Kevin Coughlin	X		
Rebecca Gubitti	X			Brad Holley	X		
Whitney Rhyne	X			Sallie Aarmdt	X		
Tom Buckingham	X			Cindy Scaruffi-Klispie	X		
Jacqueline Davis	X			Mary Sue Chupak	X		
Michael Beane	X			Dennis Disarro			X
Sandi Towers	X			Sandra Coyle	X		
Rita Rubin	X			Susan Potts	X		
David Hoffman	X			<b>Guests</b>	X		
Heather Olson	X			Dobin Anderson	X		
Gary Rhine	X						

- I. Dr. Tawil welcomed the participants and provided an overview of the agenda.
- II. Dr. DeLuca asked faculty to introduce themselves.
- III. Dr. DeLuca shared some data from the first year of implementation:
  - a. Dr. DeLuca shared student career interest data from the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters with the faculty. The data from both semesters indicated that students were most interested in the health sciences and business fields. (See attached PPT). Faculty will want to encourage students to consider a variety of career paths.
  - b. Critical Thinking Data from Journal Assignment and Final Essay: The “Clarity” dimension is the area of the lowest scores.
    - i. Faculty are encouraged to provide writing feedback and encourage students to have writing reviewed by instructional assistants to receive feedback on use of Standard English and clarity.
    - ii. Faculty engaged in a rubric standardization session on July 12, 2013 in an effort to measure the reliability of the rubric and come to a consensus about levels of performance.
    - iii. Faculty are encouraged to review the Elder Paul model of Critical Thinking and become familiar with the levels of performance on the Critical Thinking rubric. Also, faculty are encouraged to review the rubrics with the students, and provide examples of both exemplary and “developing” journal entries.
- a. CCTDI: Student had significant gains in all domains in fall 2012. In spring 2013, students had significant gains in all areas except “Truth-seeking” and “Inquisitiveness.” Historically, students have been highly “Inquisitive” so it is difficult to show gains. Historically, students have had the lowest scores in “Truth-seeking.” Dr. DeLuca encouraged faculty to engage students in activities geared towards engendering a “truth-seeking” disposition. Dr. DeLuca is working with Jane Bigelow

and Bill Shuluk to develop a training for faculty on how to engender a disposition towards “Truth-seeking.” Faculty will share ideas at an upcoming Community of Practice.

- IV. Dr. Tawil reviewed the updated syllabus and the revised assignment guidelines.
- a. Critical Thinking Journal Assignment: 7 topics. Due dates for each should generally fall sometime after the topic has been discussed in class. The students should be encouraged to think critically as they complete the assignments. The Critical Thinking Journals are not just a mere “completion” assignment. Give the students constructive feedback about their use of critical thinking as demonstrated in the journal entry.
  - b. The Edison GPS Assignment: Most students will create a PPT, but other electronic formats are acceptable.
  - c. The Group Project Assignment: Students should be encouraged to be creative (PPTs are okay, but only if used as part of a creative presentation.) Professors should place students into groups.
- V. The faculty discussed the grading weights and late work. Faculty shared ideas about deducting points for late work. Dr. DeLuca reminded faculty to score all work on the rubrics to demonstrate actual achievement. If points are to be deducted, they should be deducted by entering the percentage into the grade column, NOT by providing lower scores on the rubric.
- VI. Based on the Peer Architect Evaluations and other qualitative feedback, Dr. DeLuca and Whitney Rhyne designed a set of guidelines for communicating with and supporting the Peer Architects (see attached guidelines and summary below). Whitney reviewed the guidelines with the faculty.
- a. **Communication**
    - Provide your Peer Architect with a syllabus of the course by the first day of class.
    - Copy your Peer Architect on class-wide emails.
    - Add your Peer Architect as an observer for the course in Canvas.
    - Include your Peer Architect in the planning of course activities. If you want your Peer Architect to lead any activities or ice breakers, give them advance notice so they can plan and prepare.
    - Provide a copy of all handouts to your Peer Architect.
    - Let your Peer Architect know what your expectations are for them and provide feedback.
    - Any criticism or problems with your Peer Architect should be discussed in private. Ongoing concerns should be shared with the FYE Coordinator.
  - b. **Peer Architects and the Classroom**
    - Give your Peer Architect 5 minutes towards the beginning of each class to promote campus events, pull up the FYE Events and Activities Webpage and the campus event calendar. Be attentive and let your Peer Architect own this time. This is a great way to highlight and support the GPS assignment.
    - Refer to your Peer Architect and all Peer Architects as a resource. Remind students that they can go to the Office of FYE (Lee campus) or the Academic Success Center (Collier,



Charlotte, Hendry/Glades) to get help from a Peer Architect when they have questions or need assistance.

- Ask your Peer Architects about their experiences as a way to support lessons (e.g. why time management is important, etc.). A fellow student's personal experience is relevant and has a strong impact on new students.
- Let your Peer Architect know which students are struggling and encourage the Peer Architect to:
  - ✓ Join that student's group during small group activities
  - ✓ Have a brief conference with the student just before or after class to offer assistance
  - ✓ Reach out to the student to offer out-of-class support.

c. **General Guidelines**

- A qualified instructor needs to be present to hold class. Students cannot be required to attend class unless that instructor or a qualified substitute is present. Peer Architects are not qualified substitutes. Under no circumstances should a Peer Architect be asked to conduct class in an instructor's absence.
- Peer Architects should not be asked to grade assignments. Only a qualified instructor should assess student work. However, Peer Architects do sign a confidentiality agreement which allows them access to view student grades and other sensitive information.
- Only a qualified instructor should report student grades to students. Please be sure that grades are reported within FERPA guidelines.
- Classroom management is the responsibility of a qualified instructor.
- While students complete the SIR IIs, both the instructor and the Peer Architects should vacate the room.

VII. Whitney Rhyne reviewed the topics covered in the Peer Architect Training. At the training, the Peer Architects engaged in team building activities, and received guidelines on what it means to be a Peer Architect. Also, as a response to the Peer Architect evaluation data, a "Canvas" module was included so that Peer Architects are better prepared to help students with technology. Peer Architects also reviewed campus resources and were provided a training module on scaffolding.

VIII. Dobin Anderson reviewed the Canvas course template and led a Q&A session on the use of the SLS 1515 Canvas course.

IX. Dr. DeLuca closed the meeting. She will send faculty additional fall term achievement data to review. Faculty will also review these data at the upcoming Community of Practice Sessions.