ITEM 1. Approve Minutes from 9/4/2015 meeting
Discussion: Minutes from the 9/4/15 and 9/11/15 meeting had been previously disseminated via email; minutes from that meeting were approved without comment.
Data/source: Minutes from 9/4/15 combined with 9/11/15
Action: Karen will have minutes uploaded to website.

ITEM 2. Embedded Assessment Update
Discussion: A “Student Quick Guide” version of the QEP Critical Thinking Guide was developed by David Wells and distributed by Karen Pain. Left over posters from QEP workshops were also distributed.

Gordon Rule: The revised Gordon Rule statement, vetted by faculty, is ready to go live online. There is also a Gordon Rule Statement for students.

Mindy Yale’s portfolio presentation “Embedding and Measuring Learning Outcomes” was reviewed by the committee as it highlights and promotes assessment from the faculty perspective.

Karen sent an email to all Associate Deans asking them to remind faculty, in particular, those teaching general education courses of the process and timelines for embedding assessment and reporting findings.

Campus meetings for collecting embedded assessment results and scenario results last semester were rushed. We already have three dates for spring February 19 (Belle Glade), February 26 (Palm Beach Gardens and Lake Worth) and March 18 (Boca). Last year, there was discussion on how the information was used. Donald Taylor wants us to take the discussion a step further and “close the loop” as an institution by moving forward with the results.
Associate Dean David Knopp has left the college and the committee for an opportunity in Tennessee.

Tracy Ciucci spoke about her findings pertaining to low retention rates for online and hybrid courses which she shared with Dr. Pedersen. Issues include limited web cam options, synchronized chat options for multiple courses, and email alerts when faculty is online. Suggestions include, pretests for students who want to take an online courses, let them know how much time the online class will take and address late entry to online classes. She has been a “Dean Observer” for 18 faculty members offering feedback on how they are interacting with their online classes. Other suggestions to help with online retention include a faculty mentorship program for faculty who are fearful of e-learning, automatic drop for students who failed to post or log in by a certain date. President Parker asked the faculty to consider if we have an “online college” or just “online students”. There needs to be an assessment of online students. Tracy asked for feedback and suggestions as she moves forward with implementing some of these ideas.

Data/data source:
Action: Karen will send an electronic version of the QEP Critical Thinking Student Guide to committee members via email.

ITEM 3. Cengage Presentation for Oct 30
Discussion: Sheila Scott-Lubin did contact Cengage and they did have a product that they were interested in demonstrating to the committee. Bedford did not have a product and Mcgraw Hill did not respond to Marcie Pachter. It was confirmed that Smarthinking for college-wide use would be extremely cost prohibitive. There was discussion about looking more closely at Grammarly. The discussion took a different direction when the question was asked, “What are we trying to accomplish with the tool we recommend?” Are we trying to help students or non-English faculty? Karen Pain mentioned that supporting students and faculty in Gordon Rule courses, in particular non-English courses, should be the focus of any resources being considered. Several layers of support were discussed including mentoring faculty, and a PTLC session on tying resources together. The role of SLC was addressed in supporting students as well as involving faculty in promoting and using SLC resources.

Data/data source:
Action: The committee decided not to pursue a demonstration from Cengage but instead to focus on using internal resources such the SLC and to implement a “mentorship” program for non-English faculty so that they could get direction for supporting students with writing. Karen will meet with Debra Singleton to discuss the ways to incorporate the SLC providing writing support for students.

ITEM 4. Scenario Development and Revisions
Discussion: We need to revise our scenarios while preserving them to maintain the integrity of the data we have already collected. The science faculty already met to review theirs. Scenario review groups were confirmed. I needs to be made clear why scenarios are necessary in addition to embedded assessment.

Mindy has a PowerPoint on creating a rubric. Pat will send scenarios to teams for review.

Tcherina Duncombe presented an alternative to the scenario for the different areas of the sciences using the scientific method to be reviewed by the committee. It was well received.

Data/data source:
Action: Other scenarios will be reviewed at the October meeting.
Meeting to be adjourned at 11:30am
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