**English Department Meeting Notes**

11/14/14

Lee U102, Charlotte E105, Collier M120A

Start Time: 1:35

End Time: 3:15

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, Michael Joy, and Jim Langlas

Department Meeting Begins

* Request from Prof. Ambrose to create a formal process for approving notes.
* Prof. Lehrian suggests the following plan:
  + - Post minutes after meetings on Canvas, wait five business days for comments and suggestions, and then move to online vote for approval
      * This plan receives unanimous approval
    - The minutes for the last meeting are unanimously approved through old process

Assessment: Amy Trogan and guest Joe Van Gaalen.

* Prof. Trogan begins speaking:
  + Prof. Ambrose will share handout with general assessment update.
  + Voluntary exemplary assignment assessment project:
    - Prof. Trogan explains objectives of this project and process of submitting assignment.
      * Blank artifacts are still needed. Participants just need to fill out submission information sheet and send the collection in zip file.
  + There are also going to be future opportunities to score assignments
    - People who participate will receive service credit as well as a small stipend
  + The assessment for Session A went very well.
  + Reminders about current full-semester assessment:
    - For ENC 0022, every section is being assessed
    - For ENC 1101 & ENC 1102, faculty are being asked to assess only one section.
    - When assessing the essays, they should use the official rubric to score the assignments
  + Completed templates should be sent to Prof. Trogan by end of the semester
  + Initially, wrong rubrics were dispersed (the rubric for 0022 was sent to everyone), but this issue was corrected.
  + For each instructor, the templates have already been filled out with the student info, etc. Professors will just have to add the scores.
  + There is a question about where rubrics can be found:
    - Prof. Trogan says they are on Canvas (in files) and can also be obtained by e-mailing her.
      * Prof. Lehrian adds that the goal is to archive all of the frequently used rubrics in the files section of Canvas.
  + Everyone expresses thanks to Prof. Trogan for her dedication to the project and the exemplary work that she has put in.
  + Prof. Trogan thanks everyone for their help and sends a special thanks to all of the great people she has been able to work with on the project.
* Dr. Van Gaalan begins speaking:
  + English Department has already done exemplary work.
  + 19 disciplines volunteered assignments, and the English Department finished 4th, so we have already made a significant contribution
  + Their department is new as well, but they have a great team.
    - Chain of command illustrated for department:
      * Dr. Eileen Deluca🡪 Dr. Joe van Gaalen 🡪 Crystal Revak
  + When our assessment is completed, they will run the numbers to generate an assessment report, which will allow us to see our successes and any problems.
  + He knows that the English department has a very difficult job, one of the tougher jobs in terms of the amount of work being assessed.
  + 100% assessment is the goal, but this is very difficult for us to do because of our size. However, it is also important to hit this number.
  + 100% completion will show how powerful we are as a department and that what we're doing works.
  + Hopefully, the project will make grading easier because the template will increasingly hone in on the needs of students and how they meet outcomes.
    - Prof. Lehrian- SLS uses rubric to grade; our department has not proposed this. Something people might do if they want, but there is no plan to make this part of the process.
    - Prof. Orobello- raises a concern that assessment may undermine our expertise as professors. She also notes that the unification of all assignments under one rubric may hurt students as it reduces everything to a single mean.
    - Dr. Van Gaalan’s response- Professors’ expertise is still being depended on to assess whether or not students are meeting assessments.
      * We are just going run the data. The data is not being used to make judgments, just to create results.
  + Prof. Orobello and Prof. Harris- Concern that papers will need to be assessed multiple times (once for grade and once for the assessment project) and that this effectively doubles the workload burden. There is also a question about whether or not it makes statistical sense to survey 100% of courses when a representative sample will be just as valid.
    - Prof. Van Gaalan- Assessment does not necessarily have to be related to grading. If this is the case, it may be more work. However, since the department creates and maintains the rubrics, the criteria should be things we look for any way.
      * Prof. Harris- same concept being assessed, maybe, but now professors have to go from rubric they are using to a separate document to enter scores. This effectively doubles an individual’s workload.
        + Prof. Ambrose- maybe we can hone rubrics for spring to make sure that assessment will be useful.

Prof. Bunting- notes that there are problems with scoring. It tends to work better for lower students while hindering students who are at the A/B threshold. (i.e. the rubrics, if they are strictly followed, make it easier to get a C but harder to get an A).

Prof. Ortolano- problems inherent in using numbered rubrics to grade writing. These issues will be difficult, if not impossible, to solve. Some of these issues follow from different disciplinary beliefs in the humanities/arts and sciences.

Can writing be reduced to math?

If we attempt to do this, does it produce something that is more accurate or something that is merely easier to assess? If it’s the latter, what problems follow? These are big questions.

Prof. Harris- Notes that this is the core of the issue and reiterates anxiety about using standardized rubric across all courses.

* + - * Prof. Ambrose- for sake of expediency, maybe we could touch on this again at start of the next meeting
        + Prof. Grove- Has done this type of assessment in ENC 0022, and they don't use it for a grade. It was useful for them. They learned quite a bit from it, but it was a separate process.

Prof. Lehrian- Hopes that it won’t be too time-consuming, but it is going to be more work by its very nature.

Prof. Grove- Agrees that it did create more work for professors in her department, and they had same reservations when it was initially approved, but they found the results to be very useful. Definitely worth the work.

Prof. Ambrose- Suggests bringing in Dr. DeLuca in the spring semester to discuss assessment.

* + - Prof Calabrese and Prof. Langlas- This discussion is good. Everyone’s hearts are in right place. Have to keep end goal of making ourselves better teachers in mind.
      * Dr. Van Gaalan- Goal is to make process more valuable for everyone.
        + Prof. Ambrose- Notes that assessment worked well for Speech Department but also shares broader concerns. It's a process; we have good experience in department and will find a way to do this successfully. The goal is to just do something that is productive for everyone.

Prof. Trogan- The goal is to find the proper balance between efficiency and flexibility. As coordinator, her goal is to find something that works for everyone and that is still something within reach.

* Action Item: Amanda- Motion to bring in Dr. DeLuca to have a more complete discussion during January Meeting.
  + John Pelot- seconded.
    - Unanimous Approval.

Discussion is turned over to Prof. Ambrose for Learning Assessment Committee (LAC)

* + Going to stay brief since first part went a bit long.
  + Her committee puts out an Academic Assessment Newsletter each semester and features a professor in each one.
  + The committee is moving along and working really well. It is a fabulous group of people and great work is getting done.
  + Everyone says that this all sounds great and the discussion moves to the next item.

Degree report from Prof. Hummel and Prof. Ortolano.

* + Curriculum will be finished in a couple of weeks. Once completed, it will be posted for the department and sent to Michelle Fanslau for an initial review.
  + The official proposal is in the process of being written. Everyone is very optimistic that the moratorium will be lifted. If this is the case, then we will begin offering courses next spring. If this isn’t the case, all of the work will still get done, and we’ll be ready to go as soon as things open up.
  + Curriculum has changed a bit. The goal of these changes has been to open up the degree and broaden the number of courses that our current faculty can teach and/or that they'll have an interest in teaching. We're pretty optimistic that everyone will like what they see.
  + Furthermore, we have created a relationship with Texas Tech’s graduate program in Technical Communication (one of the top programs in the country). They have agreed to let our faculty take courses at their institution and the college has agreed to fund gap coverage for four courses each summer during the next three years (normally, there would be a funding gap for these courses because the college only reimburses at Florida's in-state tuition rate). Texas Tech is ideal not simply because of their strength in technical communication, but also because they have an incredible selection of summer courses.
    - They are going to send us the list of summer courses as soon as it is developed. At this point, we will send around a form that people can use to apply for the extra funds.
  + We will discuss everything above in greater detail during the January meeting.

Textbook Updates/Vote

* + Prof. Ortolano
    - Thanks again for great work done by committee over the summer to create the curriculum document and the textbook review: Prof. Audrey Bynoe, Prof. John TenEyck, and Prof. Christine McClure
      * General discussion during which Norton Textbook emerges as a consensus favorite, though there is also some concern about the price tag ($102.5)
      * Prof. Horn asks about possibility of using no book and just allowing instructors to use free material on the internet or assigning a book if they would like to do so.
        + Prof. Ortolano seconds idea of not having an official text and allowing professors to assign the book that they think works best for the course.
      * Prof. Lehrian explains that this is not a possibility because the bookstore wants one official text on file.
      * Prof. Bunting- notes that Prof. Horn is right and a lot of material is available online
      * Prof. Ortolano- agrees but expresses some concerns about copyright issues for contemporary material.
      * Prof. Harris- supports Norton, notes that cost of our book isn't out of range compared to textbooks used in other courses, especially the sciences.
        + Prof. Ambrose- endorses the Norton textbook and requests a vote from the department.

Prof. Harris- seconds

All yes with one no vote (Prof. Grove dissenting).

* + ENC 1102 (Technical Writing) Textbook
    - Some confusion initially.
      * Prof. Lehrian says that bookstore first said we had to switch texts and then backtracked (she found the initial e-mail from the bookstore saying that we had to switch texts after they denied having sent it). Regardless, we are moving to new edition of the book at this point since the switch has already been made.
      * Prof. Bunting has been selected by Dr. Alford for RFP for textbook change and the online course redevelopment.
  + CRW Ground
    - A committee is being formed to choose a text for this course.
* ENC 0022 Modularized Course (questions about course and textbook follow)
  + Prof. Grove- What is difference between compressed and mini-semester?
    - Prof. Lerhian:
      * In compressed course, students can complete modules at their own pace without instructor input.
      * Lectures and video components will help guide students if they have trouble.
        + Students almost certainly won't go through course this way, but it's a requirement of SB 1720
      * If anyone has concerns, they are asked to let Prof. Lehrian know.
  + Prof. Grove- asks about whether or not book can be changed. There are many issues with this textbook.
    - General agreement from professors who teach this course.
    - Prof. Grove- Book was ordered incorrectly so we should be able to change it before end of two-year term.
      * Prof. Lehrian- will look into it changing the book
    - Prof. Bunting- Discussion of mini-semester:
      * When she teaches this course, she warns students about how challenging the course is at start of the semester.
      * Prof. Grove- seconds this and says that she has mixed results. Some students love it, some don’t. There is absolutely a demand for these types of courses though and they need to be available.
    - SB 1720 requires modularized and compressed courses to be available at an institution.

Updates:

* + FLAC
    - Prof. Pelot- Now Director of Florida writer's circuit.
      * Some great events are coming up.
        + Larry Baker speaking soon. Fantastic, well-known author. Coming to Charlotte campus at end of January
        + Prof. Langlas able to facilitate event on Collier Campus for winner of Anhinga Press's award
        + No writer coming to Lee Campus this academic year because no one could coordinate event.

Need a representative on Lee Campus in the future.

Prof. Pelot will be happy to set things up once a new rep is in place, but first event won't happen until the fall.

* + Peace River Press
    - Doing great. Going along doing its thing.
    - Supports FLAC (and vice versa)
    - Open mike every second Monday at Fisherman's Village. Anyone who is interested is welcome to attend.
  + Rose Kosches
    - A little over $600 to be divided between award recipients.
      * Prof. Dustin is co-chair with Prof. Ambrose this year.
      * Prof. Langlas, Prof. Wayne, and Prof. Pelot all continuing to serve as reviewers.
      * Prof. Ambrose and Prof. Dustin will try to find an easier way to circulate everything to reviewers. Working on logistics of that now, but looking forward to having a lot of great submissions.
      * Prof. Horn asks about submission deadline.
        + Prof. Ambrose- says usually end of January but chance it could be a bit later.

Discussion occurs

Possibility deadline will be mid-February.

More information will follow soon.

Course Scheduling Process

* + - Prof. Ambrose- We should ask Dr. Alford to clarify scheduling process
    - Prof. Pelot- likes to know if he's in computer classroom because of types of assignments. Would be nice if he had a clear process.
    - Prof. Lehrian- scheduling process has been ad hoc and clarity would absolutely help. Asks if Prof. Ambrose would like her to get something in writing so the department has something definite.
    - Prof. Ambrose- just wants to know if something is actually changing. Don't necessarily need something in writing. Just something.
  + Prof. Ambrose- we need to know two things:
    - * 1) What is process? Will it be the same schedule from year-to-year with minor/necessary changes?
      * 2) In the summer, full-time faculty should get priority in summer and their classes should fill first.
        + This is especially a problem with online courses, where new adjunct sections sometimes fill (and new sections open) before full-time courses fill.
      * Prof. Ortolano- question about getting access to computer classrooms. He could do a fully digital paperless class if he could be guaranteed a computer classroom, but he needs to know before the semester, and it needs to be consistent or he'll end up teaching multiple versions of the same course. Is there a way to emphasize that we need more computer classrooms?
      * Prof. Bunting- can request computer classrooms as part of the scheduling process. Something we need to do to show that this is a need on the campus.

Meeting Ends.

*Notes prepared by Scott Ortolano*