Meeting Minutes of August 19, 2014

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Present | Absent | Excused |
| **Faculty** |  |  |  |
| Batcher, Doris | x |  |  |
| Black, Cheryl | x |  |  |
| Coman, Marius | x |  |  |
| Donaldson, Kurt | x |  |  |
| Furler, Robert | x |  |  |
| Hepner, Roy | x |  |  |
| Hermann, Henry | x |  |  |
| Hooks, Ed | x |  |  |
| Huang, Li | x |  |  |
| Israsena Na Ayudhya, Thep | x |  |  |
| Jester, Roz | x |  |  |
| Koepke, Jay | x |  |  |
| Liu, Qin | x |  |  |
| Manacheril, George | x |  |  |
| McDevit, Dan | x |  |  |
| McGarity, Lisa | x |  |  |
| McKenzie, Jonathan | x |  |  |
| O’Neal, Lyman | x |  |  |
| Russell, Micah | x |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Present | Absent | Excused |
| Ottman, Tina | x |  |  |
| Prabhu, Nimmy | x |  |  |
| Romeo, Peggy | x |  |  |
| Trevino, Marcela | x |  |  |
| Ulrich, Melanie | x |  |  |
| Vala, Teju | x |  |  |
| Verga, Vera | x |  |  |
| Wilcox, Bill | x |  |  |
| Witty, Mike | x |  |  |
| Wolfson, Jed | x |  |  |
| Xue, Di | x |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Adjunct Faculty** |  |  |  |
| Misra, Angali | x |  |  |
| Posey, Fred | x |  |  |
| Mantel, Ann | x |  |  |
| Hermann, Lisa | x |  |  |
| Athens, Wendy | x |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Welcome: The meeting started at 1:30 pm in room H101 with the faculty introducing themselves to the group. This was followed by a short briefing by Dr. Theo Koupelis on the general goal of the science department and welcoming the faculty for the new academic year.

2. Mentoring: Micah Russell was introduced as the new faculty member in Collier campus where he will be teaching biology and oceanography courses. Roz Jester and Jonathan McKenzie volunteered to mentor and help Micah to settle down and adjust to the new environment.

3. Course Supervisors: Courses and Course Supervisor list was reviewed and updated. Peggy Romeo volunteered to be the course supervisor for BSC1011 and Mike Witty for BSC1011L. Since Rob Cutler is not expected back, Marius Coman agreed to supervise PHY2053/54 and accompanying lab courses.

4. Syllabus submission: It was suggested and agreed that office hours need not be entered in its field on the syllabus, instead “see section XII” will be enough as long as the office hours are listed in section XII.

A suggestion to get course supervisors review the syllabi for particular courses was discussed. But it proved to be unpopular particularly due to the fact that it will be an unwelcome burden on supervisors of some courses like BSC1010 and BSC1010L with more than 20 faculty teaching these courses. A motion on this effect was voted on, but failed miserably!

5. New courses: Marius Coman agreed to finalize work on the new course PHY1020C Fundamentals of Physics and get the paper work done to be presented to the curriculum committee in the fall. Roz Jester and Jonathan McKenzie expressed interest on developing the new course ESC1000 Introduction to Earth Science.

6. Text books: Dan McDevit announced the changes for the A&P text books and the course supervisors agreed to take care of the desk copy needs o f those who need them.

7. Canvas: Canvas is a terrific learning management system and it is desirable for all faculty to use this platform as a learning resource for students. Wendy Athens said that she and Tina Davis are committed to helping faculty build course materials into Canvas. Canvas course shells are available for all the courses on the Faculty Academic page of the portal. Faculty are encouraged to use SCOPE more frequently to share ideas and also to get to know the various features of Canvas. Marcela Trevino will answer all your questions, if you have any.

8. Department meeting format: There was unanimous agreement on continuing Canvas Conference as the platform for the department meeting.

9. GE committee updates: Lisa McGarity presented a summary of the General Education Committee discussions.

* From fall of 2015, students need to take at least one state mandated general education course that appears in Part A of the general education course list. Part B contains other general education courses offered by the department.
* The science department needs to decide if a general education course should have a lab component, or at least one of the general education courses should have a lab component.
* Should the instruction be “select at least one course from part A” or “select one from part A and one from part B” or any other variations?
* Should there be a statement like “if you select a physical science course from part A, then select a biological science course from part B?”
* At present we offer only one non-major state mandated course BSC1005. Should we offer more of the recommended courses?

It was suggested that a survey be conducted to answer some of the questions related to general education courses. George Manacheril agreed to do the survey.

10. Any other issues: Robert Furler proposed that PCB3063C Genetics course does not need BSC1011 as a prerequisite. A committee of those teaching BSC1011 was set up to study this and make recommendation. Any change made to the prerequisite will be communicated to the Dean of Education.” The minutes was adopted unanimously.

11. Assessment updates: The Science Department Assessment Coordinator, Peggy Romeo explained in detail what the department needs to do in terms of General Education as well as Course Level Assessments. The following is a summary of her presentation.

**General Education Assessment:**

Since the Fall 2014/Spring 2015 General Education Program Assessment was discussed thoroughly during the Opening Session earlier in the day, little explanation was needed. Peggy Romeo, as the new department Assessment Coordinator, outlined the rationale for the present assessment plan.

1. This year is a transition year between assessment plans, so faculty involvement will provide input into next year’s process.
2. By asking for volunteers faculty can showcase their best ideas.
3. By using course embedded assessments instead of standardized assessments, students will take the assessment seriously.
4. The present plan is faculty driven; faculty decide which Gen Ed competencies are better suited for their course.
5. The present plan builds assessment from the ground up, beginning with the individual assignments and waiting to build rubrics from the assignments, instead of the usual reverse order.
6. Faculty do not have to add anything extra to their courses; we already use various assignments as assessment tools.
7. If you volunteer and then cannot carry out the assessment, you will not be penalized.

She also emphasized the need to volunteer to submit; the College expects submissions from all departments.

1. If we don’t volunteer our own assignments, we may be required to use assessments created for us.
2. Those who participate will be provided with documentation for College Service.

In addition:

1. Peggy Romeo and George Manacheril volunteered to distribute sample assessments they’ve used in the past.
2. A question as to whether all science courses will be considered Gen Ed courses was discussed, but since the new plan has not been finalized, that question could not be answered with certainty.
3. A question concerning the number of Gen Ed competencies for next year was also no t answered, but we have been told that not all courses will have the same number of competencies. For example, one course may only have one Gen Ed competency which is a good fit, while another type of course may have several.
4. Instructions were given for volunteers to submit all ideas for Fall 2014 to Peggy Romeo by September 26.

**Course-Level Assessment:**

Peggy Romeo explained that we have to conduct an assessment for all courses which are taught in all three (ground, online, dual enrollment) modalities. The only science course which meets this criterion is BSC1010; this course has a suitable assessment in progress.

Courses which also have to be assessed routinely are those which are taught both on campus and off-campus like online or dual enrolment courses.

The major emphasis disciplines should consider is that their assessment instruments adequately address all the course learning outcomes.

Disciplines were encouraged to continue collecting data for existing assessments, while looking for ways to improve them. It was suggested the best way to begin was to critically examine the course learning outcomes and make sure they are clear. Once the learning outcomes are revised, a Common Final is probably the best approach to assess these.

A question concerning everybody using the Common Final as a true final, or embedding questions into exams given throughout the course was discussed. Although no final decision was reached on this, it was generally felt that to be fair to all students a common final to be used as the true final is the best solution.

Several people voiced concern that they never received feedback concerning their assessment. Results for BSC1010, BSC1011, and BSC1005 were discussed in our first meeting last fall. Questions were tweaked due to the results. But those results came from Crystal Revak. If the assessment is simply a common lab report, a common research paper, etc, which doesn’t go to Crystal’s office, then the results are collected by the course supervisor. In either case, anybody who wishes for individual results was directed to contact Crystal directly, or their course supervisor.

12. Retention and student success

George Manacheril said that the most important purpose of assessment is student success and that we need to identify students who need help before it is too late. Using data from BSC1010 of fall 2013 and spring 2014, he emphasized the need to foster bonds between students and instructors so that students become more confident in their abilities to cope with the demands of the classroom. He suggested that we should set our goal for much higher success rate by providing positive growth experiences for students that enable them to identify their goals and talents and learn how to put them to use. One of the ways to do this is to look at and refine the strategies we use in our class rooms. Many of us use excellent teaching strategies in class to catch the attention of students and sustain their interest. If we can share these proven strategies with others, we can begin to improve our success rate. We will set aside a time slot of about 5 to 10 minutes during department meetings for volunteers to share some of the strategies they have used successfully in their classrooms. Bill Wilcox has volunteered to do this in our next meeting.

13. Since the air conditioner in the building failed, it was difficult to continue the meeting. Therefore the breakout sessions did not hold.