**English Department Meeting Notes**

1/9/15

Lee U102

Charlotte E105

Collier M120A

Start: 2:30

End: 3:44

Attendance: Amanda Lehrian, Thomas Mohundro, Thomas Wayne, Jennifer Grove, Keith Hunter, Ihasha Horn, Ellie Bunting, Scott Ortolano, John Pelot, Jason Calabrese, Marty Ambrose, Rebecca Harris, Natala Orobello, Sara Dustin, Jill Hummel, Amy Trogan, and Jim Langlas, Mary Vaughn

Dr. Alford: Updates and Q & A

* Prof. Lehrian- Dr. Alford asked to come in and talk to department today. He currently has meetings, but will be along soon and we’ll break and move to this part of agenda when he arrives.
* Dr. Alford Arrives at 2:50 and begins providing updates to the department.
  + A brochure has been created for the School of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. Only printed 1,500 copies since it will be out of date after the upcoming curriculum committee meeting.
    - * Prof. Grove- Notes that changes can still be made in February curriculum meeting, so there are two potential curriculum committee meetings that can impact requirements.
        + Dr. Alford agrees.
    - It will be used more as a reference tool than a “look at and throw away piece.”
    - It is a dynamic document, and he would like feedback so he knows how to modify it going forward.
    - The intent is to use it to market and recruit for courses.
    - The school makes up a significant portion of Gen Ed requirements (24 credits of 36). As a result, we have a major impact on every student that walks onto the campus.
    - The brochure can function as a kind of program advising guide for students.
  + Notes about faculty syllabi
    - Dr. Alford explains that he has final approval on syllabi each semester, but they need to go to prof. Lehrian first before they are sent to him.
    - The document should be titled in the following way to make filing it easier: Title of course-name of course-prof. name.
    - When student issue arises, he is able to look at syllabi to address it. The grading policy should be clear to make process easier when problems arise.
    - Reiterates how important it is to make grading policies clear.
    - As big as FSW is on assessing students’ learning, students also need to understand how they are being assessed.
    - Dr. Alford will defend and help us so long as syllabus is clear and policies are applied equitably.
    - An example is used to illustrate this process. A student issue arose and it was able to be handled successfully because everything was clear in the syllabus.
      * Questions:
        + Prof. Ambrose- appreciates that Dr. Alford is protecting and supporting professors.

Prof. Ortolano- seconds the note of appreciation. It’s great to know that we are being supported.

Prof. Alford- Of course, it’s great to have such good faculty and important to maintain standards for both our students and the college.

* + Office Hours
    - Please send office hours to Ms. Enyart so he can have them on file. If students ask when a professor is available, he’ll be able to let them know.
  + The Summer and Fall schedules will start to be developed on Monday. They have one month to develop summer schedule and two months to develop the fall schedule.
    - Developing faculty schedules
      * Spring schedule needed to be re-built from scratch, and the approach that was used to do that is being utilized for the upcoming semester.
      * Things that were canceled or not run were not carried over to the next semester.
      * Before the spring semester, course caps were inconsistent because they were being adjusted to rooms. This wasn’t fair to teaching loads so the course caps were evened out.
        + The new computer schedule just looks to fit rooms into room caps. When they ran S25, they ran English last. As a result, many classes were put into N, but caps were supposed to be 21, and this created logistical problems. Caps were adjusted in the system after the rooms were reevaluated and deemed capable of housing 25 students.
      * Have to build summer schedule and coming fall schedule from scratch. Two big problems:
        + First problem: How many seats do we need?

They were able to look at previous courses to figure out needs and sections were created to meet these needs. This was done under assumption that enrollment would be flat.

* + - * + Second problem: What days/times are those classes assigned?

Looked at previous success rates to determine how this was done.

Wanted to get information to faculty a week earlier so everyone could just plug themselves into different slots, but it was unfortunately delayed a week. That shouldn’t be an issue this time.

98% of people got exactly what they asked for.

As data continues to roll in, it gets easier to adjust schedules.

They added a number of sections to initial schedule because faculty asked for it. He wants to work with faculty as much as possible. If it makes on schedule, then the courses are good to go.

Unfortunately, he ended up canceling approximately the same number of sections that he added by faculty request.

The number one goal is to build courses that meet students’ needs and work for faculty. Keep in mind, they have to build courses where students will take them.

* + - * + They will build summer and fall schedules in the same way. Initial sets will be created based on what made in the past, and he will ask departments/faculty what the other needs are.
        + M/W courses are difficult because they leave the room empty on Friday and limit the number courses that can be offered in a given room (3 M/W/F courses can be fit in the same space of 2 T/R courses). That being said, he is open to input so long as room space isn’t wasted and the distribution of different types of class schedules is equal among all departments.
        + Once courses are established in new schedules, it’s easier to roll schedules over for future semesters.

Assessment:

* Prof. Lehrian
  + There was a lot of discussion about assessment during our last meeting. One of the main issues was how many of our courses should be assessed. To determine this, a survey was given to the department. Here are the results:
    - The average percentage of composition courses that people wanted to assess is 30%.
      * Some people responded with a number as low as 5% and as high as 80%.
    - Only three people thought rubric needed to be revised. The rest thought it was okay.
    - Prof. Trogan will meet with Dr. Van Gaalen about the percent we will assess. Initially, it seemed like they wanted 100% and that it would be difficult to change this, but the meter has moved
* Prof. Trogan
  + Prof. Trogan provides a handout outlining different approaches for sampling courses (included after notes).
  + Series of presentations on assessment during professional development days. It went well in terms of the presentation content, but there were some technical issues with the polycom system.
  + She meets with Dr. Van Gaalen next week, and he is going to create a report for us.
  + Some people still have not submitted artifacts. If you’re in this group, please submit them when you can. She’s letting Dr. Van Gaalen know that further material is coming.
  + Sampling procedures:
    - The percentage of artifacts surveyed is a dependent variable, but she was told that we can get close to the percentage we want as a department after we pick a procedure. This procedure determines the percent of courses that need to be assessed.
    - The handout breaks down different sampling procedures and their drawbacks/advantages.

*The Polycom connection to the Charlotte and Collier campuses drops. Prof. Trogan continues as attempts are made to reestablish the connection*

* + - The convenience Cluster Sampling was used last time, and it worked, but as the sheet notes, it has some significant drawbacks.
    - Prof. Trogan’s preference is for multi-stage stratified sampling and simple random sampling. Of these two, her top choice is multistage stratified sampling, but the department needs to come together and provide broader input after everyone has a chance to review the various strategies. It’s important that we find a process that works for everyone.
      * Prof. Ambrose: The department did multistage-stratified sampling in the past and it went well.
    - Dr. Van Gaalen got in touch with her (Prof. Trogan) earlier and said that if there is anything specific that we want to get from assessment, just let him know, and he’ll work on strategies for obtaining that information.

No questions. Everyone will review and a vote on which assessment strategy to use will be taken in a month or so.

Degree report from Prof. Hummel and Prof. Ortolano

* Nothing new to report. Currently just working on the degree proposal for the state with Dr. Wright, Dr. Weir, and Dr. Fanslau. This proposal will be sent to the state by March 1st, and it is coming along (currently over 70 pages). Until the proposal goes in, we will have nothing to update. However, we will be sure to keep in touch with everyone via Canvas when we do have something new to report.

Connect DE

* Prof. Lehrian
  + Some DE students are having problems getting access to Connect because the used books don’t have a viable access code.
  + Prof. Lehrian has been given access codes for developmental students. Please get in contact with her if any dual-enrolled students are having trouble accessing the course. There is no reason for them to have to pay out of pocket.
  + Prof. Trogan- Do we still have access to Smart thinking?
    - Prof. Lehrian- It should be working, and students should still have access to it.
    - Prof. Horn- It’s there, but students have to use Bucs ID to login
      * Other problem: Maria Cahill is still contact person.
        + Prof. Lehrian will address this and update contact person to herself.

*Polycom Connection Restored (and there is much rejoicing)*

ENC 0022 Modularized Course and Textbook Update

* Prof. Lehrian
  + The modularized course is in the final stages of development. It will be used through Canvas rather than Connect so that it is more pliable and doesn’t need to be rebuilt if a textbook change occurs.
  + Have received permission to get rid of the current textbook for developmental courses.
    - Potential texts are on hand and information will be disseminated to faculty who teach those courses so that a decision can be made.

Academic Standards Committee Inquiry About Writing Intensive Courses

* Prof. Mohundro
  + On Academic Standards Committee, and the committee wants to know what constitutes a Writing Intensive course. How should it be defined?
    - Prof. Lehrian- Dr. Wright is currently writing a new COP for writing intensives, so it isn’t clear why there is any confusion.
    - Prof. Grove- Learning Outcomes define how the Writing Intensive requirement is fulfilled in each course.
      * Prof. Ambrose- Inquires about what is being changed in the COP. Just want to be sure nothing significant is being altered without faculty input
        + Prof. Lehrian- As far as she understands it, the terminology is just being changed (Gordon Rule to Writing Intensive) to adhere with new language used by the state.

Endowment

* Prof. Lehrian
  + Need to revisit what to do with endowment funds.
  + Dr. Alford said we could revamp WPA position and give funds to this person, could give funds to the Writing Center to help support the work being done there, or could give the money to other initiatives (writing contests, events, etc.).
    - If we take the latter route, we would need to write something justifying why we don’t need money for the WPA position and/or why it would be better used funding the other initiatives.
  + We don’t have time for an extended discussion today, but can cover some quick points:
    - The name can be changed (as some have suggested), but it also might be best to leave the name to prevent any confusion.
  + The broader issue will be reposted to on Canvas so that the discussion can be revamped for the department’s next meeting.

Updates:

FLAC

* Prof. Pelot
  + Everything is going well.
  + Larry Baker, a novelist form Iowa, will be on the Charlotte Campus on Monday, the 26th, at 4:30.

Peace River

* Prof. Pelot
  + Things going really well. New reader coming in for event that Prof. Ambrose and Prof. Chase have worked to set up.

Serendipity

* Prof. Orobello
  + Awards ceremony coming up
  + Winners have been announced
  + Things going well!

Rose Kosches

* Prof. Ambrose
  + Speaker coming in as a result of the project that Prof. Horn, Prof. Ambrose, and Prof. Pelot worked very hard on this past summer.
    - Lu Vickers, the speaker to whom Prof. Pelot alluded in Peace River section, coming to give a talk. She is a great author, and everyone really excited about it. A great opportunity for the campus.
    - The event has been made possible by Prof. Chase, who found the necessary funds.

Scheduling/Classroom Issues:

* Prof. Lehrian
  + People have been getting in touch with her about room issues that have arisen this semester because of the new room assignment system.
  + Problems seem to be especially frequent with Building N.
  + The issues will be handled as well as they can. Please let her know about things so that any problems can be relayed to administration.

Kudos to Prof. Ambrose, Prof. Trogan, and Prof. Ortolano

* + Prof. Ambrose- just sold her most recent mystery novel!
  + Prof. Trogan- published article in *Southwest Florida Parent & Child* about school choice.
  + Prof. Ortolano- Special guest co-editor for forthcoming issue of *South Atlantic Review*. Issue includes an article and introduction that he co-wrote. It is slated for publication later this spring.

New Business

* Prof. Ortolano
  + LIT 2000 course going through next curriculum meeting. Please come out and support if you can.
* Prof. Lehrian
  + ENC 1101 & ENC 1102 modifications also going through that meeting.

*Notes Prepared by Prof. Scott Ortolano*

Prof. Trogan’s Assessment Handout

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sampling Method** | **Description** | **Application** | **Biases** |
| Convenience Cluster Sampling | The entire population of a randomly selected set of clusters as defined by convenience is sampled. | Student submissions are “clustered” by course section, so that all essays in a chosen section will be collected.  Essays from one section per faculty are collected. | Faculty with low course loads will be over represented in results.  And subset groups such as dual enrollment or online courses may be under represented.  Overall, results are less precise than simple random or stratified sampling. |
| Cluster Sampling | The entire population of a randomly selected set of clusters is sampled. | Student submissions are “clustered” by course section, so that all essays in a chosen section will be collected.  Courses selected randomly.  Not all faculty members will be selected in a given term while others may have more than one section selected. | Course sections with low enrollment counts can cause over representation in other areas.  (Example: One section has 8 students while another has 25 students.  A sampling of this nature means the latter section is over represented (if sections were identical this would be fine, but each section includes a number of variables such as class meeting time, campus, faculty member, class type such as online or dual enrollment, etc.)  And subset groups such as dual enrollment or online courses may be under represented.  Overall, results are less precise than with simple random or stratified sampling. |
| Multistage (1-Stratified, 2-Cluster) | Groups identified as independent of each other are identified and cluster sampling is conducted randomly from within each group | Student submissions are “clustered” by course section, so that all essays in a chosen section will be collected.  Courses randomly selected to accurately represent differing sites (i.e. campus-based, online, dual enrollment).  Not all faculty members will be selected in a given term while others may have more than one section selected. | Faculty with low course loads will be over represented in results.  Course sections with low enrollment counts can cause over representation in other areas.  Overall, results are less precise than with simple random or stratified sampling. |
| Stratified sampling | A population is separated into groups and random samples are selected from those groups | Courses randomly selected to accurately represent differing course types (i.e. campus-based, online, dual enrollment | Each site would have an identified number of submissions that would need to be collected (see expected sample size discussion below). Faculty with low course loads can be over represented. |
| Simple random sampling | Random samples from entire population are sampled. | A random selection of artifacts from courses are sampled with no regard for section representation (e.g. it is reasonable to assume one section could get 10 artifacts selected from it while another gets 0, sample size notwithstanding).  Not all faculty members will necessarily participate while others may have larger than average samples to be collected. | A sample size that meets reasonable statistical criteria can vary depending on enrollment.  Generally speaking, a larger enrollment means a smaller percentage is required.  Based on present enrollments, ENC1101 would require approximately 16% while ENC1102 would require approximately 34%.\* |

Sample Size Estimations:

Based on the present Fall 2014 enrollment for ENC1101, a sample size that would reasonably meet standards for statistical analysis is approximately 560 artifacts.

o   In a simple random sample, a faculty member with 125 students in ENC1101 can expect to submit scores for an average of 20-25 essays per semester.

Based on the present Fall 2014 enrollment for ENC1102, a sample size that would reasonably meet standards for statistical analysis is approximately 440 artifacts.

o   In a simple random sample, a faculty member with 125 students in ENC1102 can expect to be submit scores for an average 40-45 essays per semester.

\*A power analysis was conducted to estimate the sample size requirement for a reasonable difference from the null hypothesis (sample deviates from population) with a reasonable level of power required for strong results (p=0.80) given a known population size (enrollments for Fall 2014 of ENC1101 and ENC1102).