PALM BEACH STATE COLLEGE

CLUSTER MEETING MINUTES
ENGLISH
Wednesday, March 26, 2014
1:00 P.M.
BA 204

In Attendance: Robin Fiedler, Mike Marzelli, Pat Tierney, Roberta Proctor, Art Brockway, Karin St. Pierre, Sheila Scott-Lubin, Nancy D. McDonald, Jackie Berg, David Abbodonza, Michele Piggle, D.C. Gossman, D.J. Marshall, N. Peifer, Maikel Leon Espinosa, Tim Benham, Trinna Frever, Sue Aguilla, Thomas Wilson, [illegible] Haley, Thomas Capers, Steven Gibson, Traci Klass, John Ribar, Rachel McDermott, Jenifer Skolnick, Mary Pernal, Brad Johnson, Chris Pumphrey, Irving Berkowitz, Patti Osterman, Mary Galvin, Mike Marzelli, Edwin Peck, David Duncan, Pat McDonald, Bruce Beck, Nick LaRocca, David Nixon, Vicki Scheurer, Chris Schmersahl, Regina Dilgen, Deborah Snowberger, Diane Baird, Matt Klauza

ITEM #2: Bachelor's Program Faculty and English Cluster joint meeting as part of our improvement strategies for Gen Ed embedded assessment 2014-15. Discussion focus is on ENC 1102 outcomes/assignments and upper-level academic writing expectations.

Discussion: Dr. Kaplan, Tom Capers, Richard Change, and other business faculty shared their challenges with student writing: there is a wide range of abilities; issues with APA format; even a five-paragraph essay format. Dr. Kaplan said one challenge was that business faculty members lack a background in writing, yet there is a substantial amount of writing in their courses.

Any faculty interested in teaching business writing should contact Laura Gainer.

Discussion ensued about:
- MLA vs. APA styles. MLA is English-field-specific.
- The need for more writing across the curriculum
- Content-specific 1102 courses (1102 for business majors, or for science majors, etc.) which would allow faculty to address APA or MLA for students' future needs
- Writing Across the Curriculum is being planned
- The inadequacies of SafeAssign: The Joint-Cluster expressed the need for turnitin.com and the functions it has. The cost of SafeAssign is not what was proposed and the cost will rise.

Motion: (Trinna Frever): to request to readopt turnitin.com (seconded). VOTE: Agreed. Unanimous.

Action: concerns will be compiled and the request will be put forth (see Appendix A).

Discussion ensued:

- Dr. Kaplan offered praise for working together with the English Cluster. She also asked and English agreed to continue the joint cluster meeting in the Fall.
- The clusters also discussed the need for SCORE to be more detailed and/or offer more quality communication on the "closing" of score.
- Lack of Administration support for an institutional policy on plagiarism: In the past, the cluster has put forth suggestions, and they have been rejected. Perhaps the college could use the Business Program to pilot a policy. The English Cluster supports this suggestion. The clusters discussed the importance of consequences for plagiarism, including it being recorded on their student record for any offense (and if only once, then it be removed upon graduation). It was suggest that someone find out if it was possible and the legal ramifications of doing so.
- How Anti-Plagiarism is taught: library homepage has resources on plagiarism education—see their "Plagiarism Resources: link. Indiana University (Bloomington) has good resources online.
- Tom Capers explained the Capstone course in the business department: it is the most challenging assignment that students encounter at PBSC. The failure rate is high. Students have trouble with grammar and sentence structure. There is a dire need for a faculty advisor (on course release) to direct students in their projects. Administration would have to recognize the work involved in so directing students.
- It was suggested that the business department needs a full-time writing faculty.
- Sheila Scott-Lubin recommended that the Bachelor's program reach out to the SLC for Capstone Tutors. The SLC has asked what (other) things we need them to do.

[Adjourned: The Joint-Cluster meeting with the Business Department]

ITEM #1 (completed out of order): Matt Klauza asked for feedback on "The Word." He encouraged faculty to continue to send him both professional and personal news for the newsletter.

ITEM #3: Improvement strategies:

Discussion:

- The cluster listened to Helen Shub's recording.
- The ENC packet is complete. 2 strategies presented. (See Appendix B)
- We will no longer use the Gen Ed reporting tool. Instead, we will report an aggregate score for our students.
- For the LIT packet, scores were good.
- The cluster discussed options for improvement of strategies for the literature packet.

Action: Vote to approve the improvement strategies for ENC: Motion Passed (unanimous)

Robin will type up the improvement strategies for LIT (see Appendix B) and distribute the cluster's strategy for online vote. See Online Voting results below.

ITEM #4: ENC 1141 Writing about Literature.

Discussion:
- Robin explained the rationale for the need for change: there is overlap between ENC 1102 and ENC 1141
- Some members expressed concern for redundancy between LIT 1000 and ENC 1141
- Some members shared: 1141 should focus on writing with Literature; LIT 1000 should focus on literature
- Discussion whether or not ENC1102 should be limited to a non-literary base.
- A plea was made to agree that the adjunct text will focus on non-literary aspects
- There is a need to discuss with the adjuncts the importance of argument
- 1141 should be encouraged for students who are humanities majors
- 1141 stands, the cluster resolved that there wasn't an overlap between 1141 and LIT 1000.

Item #5: ENC 1102 Adjunct Textbook

Discussion:
- Recommendation of new book for 1102 that would include a persuasive essay.
- Faculty member mentioned that 1102 still should include literature. Some faculty members are hesitant to teach this course without a literary element. There seem to be different approaches.
- Robin Fiedler made a motion to limit literature to be no more than 1/3 of 1102 curriculum. There was a second. One faculty member took the floor before the vote and made a plea for more academic freedom and objected to a Cluster vote limiting literature. She did agree that 1102 should, however, not be only about literature, but argument and research as well. The vote was dropped, and instead Robin proposed that cluster's selection of the adjunct textbook should determine 1102's non-literary emphasis.
- Honors 1141 has a textbook (Perienne's). No adjuncts teach this course.
- Questions have arisen about how to consolidate the 1102 course. People aren't sure if more control of the course content is needed.
- People feel that adjuncts need to be included.

Action: Motion to move the vote to an online vote. Vote: Motion Passed (unanimous). (See results below).

ITEM #6: LIT 1000 Introduction to Literature

Discussion: None.

Action: Motion to move the vote to an online vote. Vote: Motion Passed (unanimous). (See results below)

Item #7: Proposal to change ENC 1102 outcome

Discussion: The outcomes language is as follows: "Complete a research project that deals with a subject suitable for library research, uses written materials of others as its primary sources of information, and documents all information gleaned from research using MLA [and/or APA] style." Pat Tierney proposed the bracketed change here.

Motion: (seconded) To change the language as proposed above

Action: Vote: Motion Passed (unanimous)

Item #12: Election of Cluster Chair and Secretary (completed out of order)

Discussion: Nominations were made. The group wanted to make it clear that leading the lab is not the Chair's responsibility.
The cluster agreed that the course lead for ENC1101L should not be included with Cluster Chair duties, and that a course lead should be paid release time to coordinate and revise the curriculum each year.
Action: Motion to create release time for Lab coordinator. Vote: Motion Passed (unanimous)
      Vote for Cluster Chair: Art Brockway (Unanimous)
      Vote for Secretary: Mary Pernal (Unanimous)

Item #8: Proposal to make ENC 1101 a pre-requisite for ENC 1210 Technical Communication

Discussion: The cluster discussed the reasoning behind the ENC1101 pre-req. Bruce Beck explained the basics of ENC1101 are necessary to complete the Technical Writing 1210 assignments.

Action: Vote: Unanimously approved. Then one faculty member pointed out that the pre-req may cause a problem with some of the AS Program degrees. Cluster agreed that the vote should carry as long as Kathleen Gamble checked on any possible AS Degree conflict.

Item #9: Abandon the Bedford PBSC custom edition? Update Student Essays?

Discussion: The customized edition is cheaper at $72 than the other version. It has a sample essay assignment.

Action: Motion: Chris Pumphrey will lead updating of essays in the customized edition of our PBSC version of the Bedford handbook. Vote: Motion Passed (unanimous)

Item #10: Vote on Voting Procedures

Discussion: Revisions have been made to clarify the procedural guidelines, including the following: 2/3 of the cluster was a requirement for the passage of the procedural guidelines, which went to an online vote. But regular online votes, as we discussed them, would only require a simple majority of a participating quorum. Chris Schmersahl presented on behalf of the Procedural Rules Committee, explained proposed changes and asked for feedback. Response was positive. A question was raised about the 72-hour deadline for voting, given that exceptional situations arise, and whether exceptions should be made for extenuating circumstances. Faculty member recommends that we add 12 hours for exceptional situations. Another suggestion: language that would allow longer for the vote.

Action: Chris S. will do some research.
The voting procedures will be put forth for online vote (as approved in the previous cluster meeting). See results below.

Item #11: Improving ENC 1101L

Discussion: The state has approved the college's Lab. It will continue. Small changes have been made. This was a first run-through. We have a new course description for ENC1101, which tells students how to be exempted from the lab. There is a face-to-face ENC1101 class that has an online 1101L with the same students. Some people find the fully online lab too cumbersome and too much work. One faculty member suggests McGraw Hill program (this suggestion was endorsed by others). People say to scale back on the Skillsclass requirements—particularly for the fully-online lab. Cluster expresses that there is a high level of dissatisfaction among the students.

Action: The readings for the online lab will be switched out. Faculty will form a committee to review these and other changes. Nick LaRocca volunteered to lead the first annual curriculum revision. Rachel McDermott offered to help. [The remainder of the committee was formed after the cluster meeting]
     Motion to create an online vote to change the Bedford Skillsclass to a McGraw Hill product. (Seconded). The motion did not carry because it would be impossible to switch by Fall and because the faculty would have to be trained, etc.
     The cluster agreed to invite McGraw-Hill and Pearson to do campus demonstrations of their products, up until the next development day, then have a possible change on the cluster agenda for Fall.

Meeting Concluded 4:10 PM

<u>Additional Online Vote Following the Meeting Re: 1102 Adjunct textbook</u>

Result: ENC 1102 adjunct text for the next 3 years is Lunsford's *Everything is an Argument with Readings*

<u>Additional Online Vote Following the Meeting Re: LIT1000 Adjunct textbook</u>

Result: LIT 1000 adjunct textbook for the next 3 years is Kennedy's *Literature: An Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, Drama, and Writing.* Interactive ed

<u>Additional Online Vote Following the Meeting Re: Gen Ed Assessment Packet Literature Improvement Strategies</u>

Result: Passed.
32 votes total:
Yes – 28
No – 3
Abstain – 1

<u>Additional Online Vote Following the Meeting Re: Voting Procedures Document</u>

Result: NOT Passed.
32 votes total:
Yes – 24 (needed 2/3 or 26 to pass)
No – 4
Abstain – 3
Other – 2

<u>Appendix A:</u> **On the March 26, 2014, Academic Development Day meeting , the Joint-Cluster expressed the need for turnitin.com and the functions it has. It also outlined the inadequacies of SafeAssign. Below is a list of topics and examples of why Turnitin is not only a superior product to SafeAssign, but also why Turnitin is a necessary part of maintaining academic integrity in areas where SafeAssign falls short.**

1. There are a number of issues with SafeAssign that hinder a professor's ability to do his/her job as effectively:
- The time-consuming issues with using a Blackboard Grading Rubric with SafeAssign: SafeAssign causes this extra set of steps that must be done to use both SafeAssign and a grading rubric for each student submission. While this sounds insignificant, when grading hundreds of essays, this becomes problematic.
- Turnitin.com will also automatically generate an alert if less than a certain percentage (customizable by the professor) of an essay isn't in the student's own words. That is, it has an over-quoting alert. Safe Assign doesn't even distinguish between quoting and plagiarism.
- SafeAssign is not user-friendly; creating and accessing assignments are each multi-step processes that require several links within the webpage, none of which is self-explanatory. In Turnitin.com, these were readily apparent processes, often requiring only one step each, rather than three or four apiece.
- turnitin allows the instructor to see the whole paper, but often SafeAssign only allows the professor to see rectangular blocks of text.
- Turnitin can save students paper, particularly on a first draft, and instructors time.
- turnitin has is the color coding for various sources used, which allows professors to see which parts of the student's writing comes from which sources; SafeAssign lumps all of them together so that the professor is forced to sort out the individual sources.
- Turnitin.com will automatically tell the word count on a student essay; SafeAssign does not.
- SafeAssign is "buggy"; it often shuts down and/or forces students to resubmit essays they already have submitted.
- SafeAssign isn't as thorough and often not reliable; too often, SafeAssign doesn't flag blatent plagiarism, or will only flag it upon submitting the essay multiple times.

2. The switch allows increased academic dishonesty. SafeAssign (the product that is supposed to replace turnitin) doesn't have the same paper repository that we have been using:
- When a student submits a paper to turnitin, turnitin adds it to its database so that another student down the road can't use that same paper
- While SafeAssign has a similar approach, the switch to SafeAssign has resulted in the loss of the database in which all of PBSC' students' papers have been saved over several years. This now allows students to reuse others' papers for their own classes.
- Switching has created a gap that has allowed this "recycling" to begin without any proof of academic dishonesty.
- Considering the frequency with which students "recycle" their own or their friends' papers for classes, this allows students to freely and easily commit academic dishonesty.

3. Students and faculty already are familiar with turnitin:

• Students are often already familiar with turnitin, either from other courses here at PBSC (Social Science/PoliSci, History, Criminal Justice especially seem to have several faculty who use this software), or from their high schools. The advantages of this familiarity are that the access is easy and requires little or no training, and it also is not stigmatized nor frightening because it is familiar for them.

• In the past, Pat Tierney, Bruce Beck, Connie Tuisku, and Mary Galvin presented on behalf of the PTLC at Development Day on issues of Plagiarism and a presentation on turnitin was part of this. Their presentation was informative and well-received.

• The Library staff are quite familiar with it

4. Turnitin and SafeAssign are two different products. While SafeAssign does have the plagiarism prevention function that turnitin does, it doesn't have the grading function (called Grademark) that turnitin has, which allows instructors to grade student papers electronically, in a paperless manner.

• Paperless grading saves students money on copy costs and the college money on maintenance and repair of the campus printers.

• Faculty across campuses have used this grading function for some time now, with much success.

• It allows instructors to provide students with TONS of feedback with only a few clicks-- more feedback than is possible grading by hand--and they can provide this feedback efficiently.

• For example. With two clicks of the mouse, a professor can add the following comment to a student's paper: "You have an issue with using a comma with an introductory phrase: When you begin a sentence with a phrase, you need a comma after the phrase/ before the rest of the sentence. For example: While we were studying, we saw one of our friends. Notice the comma placement here. See Chapter 32b in you handbook for more information on this issue." If that same professor were to try to make such a comment on every student's paper, it would take weeks to grade one set of papers.

• The comments are easily customizable by the professor so that he/she can provide a wealth of feedback very quickly--such as an explanation, an example, and a reference to the text for additional support.

• Turnitin's Grademark function is available (and easily customizable) for any instructor in any course.

5. Writing Across the Curriculum possibilities: Turnitin's Grademark grading function has a lot of potential for writing across the curriculum (W.A.C.)

• If we are pushing writing across the curriculum, it would work so well for other departments, making writing not feel so much like a burden. And they can customize their comments to fit their individual academic needs.

• A workshop for faculty (perhaps on development day) will easily illustrate to all faculty the benefits of grading with it (not just English faculty, but ALL faculty). It will help encourage faculty across the curriculum, both in grading and in providing feedback (and, of course, preventing academic dishonesty).

Appendix B: Improvement Strategies:

Improvement Strategies for ENC:
- Collaborate with Bachelor's Program faculty to better prepare our ENC1102 students for upper level course academic writing skills expectations.
- Request support from Administration in proving funding for district wide calibration grading sessions using the ENC rubric that MUST include adjuncts twice a year. Both full-time and adjuncts should be paid and required to attend.

Improvement Strategies for LIT:
- The rubric numbers will be changed to letter grades and calculated into the students' semester grades: 1=F, 2=B, 3=C, 4=B, and 5=A.
- Cluster will share model essays that exemplify the A (previously 5) criteria of the rubric for literary analysis. If possible, include those model essays in the custom Bedford Handbook for students and faculty guidance.
- Cluster will wait for next year's embedded assessment results before discussing any more changes.

Matt Klauza and Mary Pernal
Scribe
c. Minutes Distribution List