

CLUSTER MEETING MINUTES

ENGLISH

Tuesday, Oct. 13th

BA 204

In Attendance: Brockway, Arthur J; Chambers, Lauren R; Clouse, Laura E; Cuthbertson, Charles T; Klauza, Matt D; Larson, Holly A; Pernal, Mary C; Pumphrey, Christopher; Schmersahl, Christopher J; Skolnick, Jenifer A; Aguila, Susan D; Baird, Diane S; Beck, Bruce M; Benham, Timothy L; Brahlek, Steve J; Dilgen, Regina M; Duncan, David D; Fiedler, Robin; Fine, Africa R; Galvin, Mary E; Johnson, Bradley R; Klass, Traci M; Larocca, Nicholas T; Marzelli, Michael A; McDonald, Nancy D; McDonald, Patricia R; Nixon, David H; Peck, Edwin T; Osterman, Patricia P; Policy, Carole; Proctor, Roberta L; Ribar, John; McDermott, Rachel M; Snowberger, Deborah I; Stonecipher, Melissa; Tierney, Patrick C; Wilber, Elizabeth J; Reardon, Karen; Irizarry, Adella; Shepardson, Richard; Martin, Valrie; Aquila, Sue; McLaughlin, Idell

Item 1: Approved Minutes

Item 2: Fall Diagnostic and Rubric

- Several faculty expressed concerns stating that there needs to be other alternatives raising the following points: 1. We are skipping over a major assumption, 2. How can it be successful without data, and 3. There is some merit to evaluate data in the middle of the term
- We were put in groups to compare notes on diagnostic administered to students
- We then met as a large group reporting what we discussed in smaller groups. The following is the feedback from groups:
- 1. Did use it, some different readings (possible reading changes all on same level
- Transfer out? (some, but a few limited)
- Administrative issues (withdrawal)
- Advised to leave some were able to make more of an effort
- Rubric changes scoring rubric for class calibration meetings (norming) on campuses
- Two topics given (write an essay possible change)
- 2. Summary writing was not helpful

- Reading took away from the writing
- Could not evaluate
- Class topics were more effective
- No success in students going to a new class (dev)
- Need to track how students are doing
- Missing an opportunity to follow up and samplings
- 3. rubric was harder to use few 5s
- Few got out
- Typos in the reading
- Gave back diagnostic and had them grade themselves (wrote a paragraph about their grade vs teachers, strategies, more of a diagnostic. Taking responsibility and reflection)
- 4. reading prompts were different levels to compare
- Used all 3 prompts
- Did not know what a summary was assess on two levels
- Did not enjoy the readings (errors in the articles)
- Were graded lower, more response than summary.
- Some left the class, and others recommended to the lab
- Feedback is good, but time consuming. Could have other writings
- 5. Students leaving, what happens to them?
- Students having problems taking the test (anxiety for timed writing?)
- Students disappeared (some were taken to the advisor)
- See the purpose, but problems with execution or outcomes
- 6. What do we need to know? Need to simplify the rubric
- Two boxes to check you either pass or fail
- Tell the deans and advisors (to follow up)
- Benefit to be on the same page to help each other
- More reading options
- 7. none of the categories have grammar issues in the rubric
- Need reference to grammar in rubric
- Remember they are in class writings could not be their best writing
- Need to remember to build them up
- - summary might be a higher level skill
- 8. used an old class essay to assess as a reading
- -want to see the basics in the writing
- later in the term could be better for response readings
- students want to know how they are doing (numbers could be valuable)
- Where they are at now is not where they will be, and there was enough to work with
- How we used the scores
- rubric doesn't address basic level skills
- need something that addresses reading comprehension
- 9. Last remarks -

We need to know what EAP classes are offered

Item 3: Class Size

- Some concerns faculty expressed was the lack of space for more sections of writing and literature courses
- Others expressed the need to back it up with positive outcome from having less students
- From administration perspective, it may ask why several of us teach overloads if we feel there are too many students to teach and too many papers to grade
- We need a strategic argument and more research; we should look at best practices at other state colleges
- We need a diagnostic in ENC 1102 to track the success of ENC 1101
- We need to save post-test in ENC 1101
- Several faculty expressed that data should already existed. One faculty member mentioned that
 when she began teaching at PBSC, there were 18 students in ENC 1101 and ENC 1102. Why not
 compare this data to today's results?
- English instructors do much more grading so why not keep class size but only teach 4 courses:? Many faculty asserted that this will not work well with other departments.
- Any data on class size, email Elizabeth Wilber
- Performance-based funding: committee is formed on this issue made up of the following faculty: Nick, Chris S., Charles, Chris P., Elizabeth, Nataliya, and Mary

Item 4: Handbooks in ENC 1101

- Should we petition for a new handbook?
- Several faculty expressed that Bedford is too expensive (up to \$120)
- Little Seagull is only \$20
- Other faculty expressed that we do not need a handbook in ENC 1101
- A couple faculty members expressed concern about not having a consistent and uniform handbook and therefore should cluster set a policy for adopting books?
- Should we build a text together as a cluster in order to save students money?
- Should we create our own reader?
- We cannot give a choice to adjuncts; should adjuncts have a choice in selection?
- Chairs from each campus should get feedback from adjuncts
- Cluster determines textbook for everyone: all in favor except one abstaining

Item 5: General Education Assessment

- Quickly reviewed the assessment score (1-5)
- Tabled conversation
- Meeting adjourned