Planning Objective Report

Objective Report:

Objective ID: 1340
Objective Title: Post-Secondary English Competency
Unit Manager: DeLuca, Eileen
Planning Unit: 00240 - College Preparatory
Obj. Status: Implementing
Obj. Purpose: Student Learning Outcome
Unit Purpose:

Objective Description:

English: Students will write at the post-secondary level that correlates with college success by completion of the developmental English sequence.

Institutional Goals	Objective Types	Planning Priorities
C. Conduct a research based curriculum/program review of DLA education	No Objective Types to Display	No Planning Priorities to Display

Tasks

Due Date	Status	Priority	Task
N/A	In Progress	High	At the August 19 department meeting, faculty will make plans for piloting the common course assessments (essay scored on a common rubric) that were designed in spring 2011. Pilot data will be reviewed in December and used to revise assessments, and inform instruction.
N/A	In Progress	High	College Prep faculty will meet with members of the Academic Success/FYE department during the Professional Development week to integrate support mechanisms for students to increase retention and success.

Assessment Measures

Date	Assessment Measure
06/23/2011	Mastery Exam for English
06/23/2011	Common Course Assessment (Essay)
06/28/2011	Success of ENC 1101 students who had taken ENC 9010/0015 and/or ENC 9020/0025.

Intended Results

Date	Intended Results
06/23/2011	During the 2011-2012 academic year, 70% of the FTIC cohort will pass the Exit Exam for English.
06/23/2011	During the 2011-2012 academic year, 70% of the ENC 0025 completers will pass the Exit Exam for English.
06/23/2011	During the 2011-2012 academic year, 80% of ENC 0025 completers will receive 75% or higher on the common course assessment (essay) as scored on a rubric.
06/28/2011	During the 2011-2012 academic year, the percentage of students who completed the developmental English sequence and passed ENC 1101 with a “C” or better, will not vary significantly from the of students who test directly into ENC 1101.

Status Reports

Report Date	Status Report
3/5/2012	On January 28, 2012 ENC 0025 faculty from Lee, Hendry/Glades, and Collier campuses engaged in a rubric standardization session for the ENC 0025 Argumentative Research Essay Rubric (see attached sign-in sheet and standardization feedback summary). The faculty scored a representative sample of essays from across the district, discussed the scoring methods in pairs, and engaged in a large group discussion of both the rubric and assignment guidelines. The IRPE office conducted an inter-rater reliability study (see attached ENC Rubric Standardization Data Correlations). The qualitative and quantitative feedback was reviewed by the Dean, Department Chair and Curriculum Specialist in February. The data will be further reviewed with ENC 0025 faculty in an upcoming March meeting. The data will inform the revision of the assignment guidelines and rubric.
2/29/2012	At the February 2012 department meeting, Dr. DeLuca and Dr. Seefchak shared data with faculty on ENC 1101 Success Rates, as provided by the IRPE office. Attached tables display rates from the years 2005 through 2011, showing that the average overall success rates for students who completed the developmental English course sequence before enrolling in ENC 1101is not significantly different from that of those students who placed directly into ENC 1101. See attached tables. See attached minutes.
12/20/2011	On December 7, 2012, Dr. DeLuca, Dr. Seefchak, and Professor Ellie Bunting met with the Dean of IRPE, Kevin Coughlin, and an IRPE research analyst, Larysa Rybak to review the results of a study regarding success rates of students in ENC 9020 and REA 9003 in both traditional (face-to-face) and e-studio modalities. Dean Coughlin reviewed 14 data tables and highlighted instances where the study yielded significant correlations (see attached e-studio study results). The group discussed the implications and how the data could inform future program offerings. Dr. Seefchak and Dr. DeLuca will share the data with the faculty at the February 2012 department meeting.
12/16/2011	On December 7, 2012, Dr. DeLuca, Dr. Seefchak, and Dr. Grove met with the English Department chair, Ellie Bunting met to discuss the ENC 0025 mastery exam and course competencies to ensure seamless curricular transitions from developmental writing into credit writing courses. Ellie described the competencies that the English department would like to see the students achieve before entering ENC 1101. The group also brainstormed ideas for how to ensure “mastery” of the competencies via an objective and/or essay exam. Based on this discussion, Dr. Seefchak and Dr. Grove will work with full-time and adjunct faculty in spring 2012 to design the mastery exam.
12/16/2011	The IRPE office provided an update to the data regarding the success in ENC 11101 of students who had completed the developmental English sequence. The attached ENC 1101 Success Rates table displays the rates from 2005-2011. IRPE office ran a t-test showing that the overall success rates for students who complete the developmental English sequence before enrolling into ENC 1101 is not significantly different from those who place directly into ENC 1101. These data will be shared with faculty at the February 2012 department meeting.
11/29/2011	On November 2, 2011, Dr. Grove and Dr. Seefchak contacted full-time and adjunct Developmental Writing faculty at all campuses and centers across the district to explain the process for the pilot of the Common Course Assessments and to tell them to expect copies of two-part carbonless rubrics.
11/29/2011	On November 4, 2011, copies of Common Course Assessment Rubrics and guidelines were distributed to all ENC faculty for use Fall 2011 semester as a pilot.
11/29/2011	On November 15, 2011, Dr. Deluca requested, from the College's IRPE Office, a random sample, representative of students from all campuses, for a standardized study of ENC 0025 writing. On November 16, 2011, Dr. DeLuca sent an email to randomly selected faculty explaining the process and collection of artifacts for the study.
11/29/2011	At a Faculty Department Meeting on November 18, 2011, Dr. DeLuca asked each discipline to share progress on exams and common course assessments. Dr. Grove reported that the ENC 0025 and ENC 0015 Common Course Assessments and the Course Mastery Exam for ENC 0025 and the Course Final Exam for ENC 0015. See meeting minutes, attached.
11/29/2011	On November 28, 2011, Dr. Seefchak met with Dr. Grove to discuss the procedures for the Common Course Assessment, to finalize decisions for the Fall 2011 semester Course Mastery Exam for ENC 0025, and to finalize the Course Final Exam for ENC 0015. Also discussed were procedures and protocols for the creation of Course Mastery and Course Final exams for use starting Spring 2012 semester and beyond.
10/28/2011	During the District Department meeting of October 14, 2011, Dr. DeLuca and Dr. Seefchak discussed Course Mastery Exams for upper level Developmental classes. Under the new ruling, S.B. 1008.30, each college must create a means by which course mastery is demonstrated. Within each of the disciplines of English, Mathematics, and Reading, faculty are constructing Mastery Exams. See attached timeline. See attached meeting minutes.

10/28/2011	During the District Department meeting of October 14, 2011, Dr. Seefchak updated faculty on the progress with each discipline on Common Course Assessments. Within each of the disciplines of English, Mathematics, and Reading, faculty have been meeting to plan creation, implementation, and scoring of assessments. See attached timeline. See attached meeting minutes.
10/28/2011	During meetings with adjunct faculty during the month of October at the Lee Campus, the Collier Campus, and the Charlotte Campus, Dr. Seefchak explained and initiated a discussion of the Course Mastery Exams for upper level Developmental classes. Under the new ruling, S.B. 1008.30, each college must create a means by which course mastery is demonstrated. Within each of the disciplines of English, Mathematics, and Reading, faculty are constructing Mastery Exams with input from adjunct faculty across the district. See the attached meeting agenda for each campus meeting.
10/28/2011	During meetings with adjunct faculty during the month of October at the Lee Campus, the Collier Campus, and the Charlotte Campus, Dr. Seefchak explained Common Course Assessments. Within each of the disciplines of English, Mathematics, and Reading, faculty are constructing Common Course Assessments with input from adjunct faculty across the district. See the attached meeting agenda for each campus meeting.
10/1/2011	Dr. Seefchak and Dr. DeLuca discussed common course assessments with faculty at the District Department meeting on Septebmer 9 (see attached minutes).Dr. Seefchak submitted the College Prep Assessment Plan to the SAC co-chair, Marty Ambrose, on Sept. 19 (see attached plan).
8/30/2011	Dr. Seefchak and Dr. Jennifer Grove discussed Common Course Assessments with faculty at the Adjunct Faculty Meeting on August 16 and at the District Faculty Meeting on August 19. See attached meeting minutes.

Actual Results

Date	Actual Results
01/16/2012	Mid-year results: During the summer 2011 semester, 80% of the students who were enrolled in ENC 1101 and had one or more developmental writing courses were successful. The IRPE office provided an update to the data regarding the success in ENC 11101 of students who had completed the developmental English sequence. The attached ENC 1101 Success Rates table displays the rates from 2005-2011. IRPE office ran a t-test showing that the overall success rates for students who complete the developmental English sequence before enrolling into ENC 1101 is not significantly different from those who place directly into ENC 1101.
01/16/2012	Mid-year results: In November 2011, the IRPE performed a study on e-studio ENC and REA courses (see attached e-studio study analyses). Results overview: 1. The study yielded evidence that ENC 1101 performance is significantly correlated with student performance in College Prep reading and writing courses. 2. The study yielded evidence that student performance in reading and writing exit exams are significantly related to their performances on the reading and writing portions of the CPT. 3. The study did not yield evidence that student performance on exit exams were related to course modality.4. The study did not yield evidence that student performance in ENC 1101 was related to their performance on CPT or course modality.
03/05/2012	Mid-year results for mastery exam: During the fall 2011 semester, 64% of ENC 0025 students district-wide successfully completed the course and passed the mastery exam. The success rate for each campus is as follows: Collier 77%, Charlotte 74%, Hendry-Glades 83%, Lee 65%. (See attached success-failure reports).

Use of Results

Date	Use of Results
01/16/2012	Both the Developmental Writing success rates data and the t-test of significance data provide by the IRPE were shared with faculty at the February 2012 department meeting (see attached minutes) and served as a point of departure for discussions about offering continuing academic and social support to Developmental Writing (ENC 0015, 0025) students.
01/16/2012	On December 7, 2012, Dr. DeLuca, Dr. Seefchak, and Professor Ellie Bunting met with the Dean of IRPE, Kevin Coughlin, and an IRPE research analyst, Larysa Rybak to review the results of a study regarding success rates of students in ENC 9020 and REA 9003 in both traditional (face-to-face) and e-studio modalities. Dean Coughlin reviewed 14 data tables and highlighted instances where the study yielded significant correlations (see attached e-studio study results). The group discussed the implications and how the data could inform future program offerings. Dr. Seefchak and Dr. DeLuca will shared the data with the faculty at the February 2012 department meeting)see attached minutes) to serve as a point of departure for discussions on emporium offerings and the possibility of expanding courses in alternative modalities in other disciplines such as mathematics.

Gap Analysis

SWOT

Units Impacted
No Units Impacted data

Associated Standards

Standard Number	Standard Description
Applied Learning	Applied Learning enables students to reinforce skills learned in Cornerstone Experience by applying them in other classes and settings. Upon successful completion of the course, students will -- Enhance their awareness of the larger diverse community both inside and outside Edison State College -- Apply one or more skills learned in the FYE course to other academic endeavors
Training and Development	3. Incorporate professional development strategies for developing metacognitive approaches through critical thinking that facilitate a learn-to-learn outcomes focus.

Associated Outcomes

Documents

File Name	File Size	Date Modified
College_Prep_Assessment_Plan_20112012_With_DOCS.docx	25.339 KB	10/4/2011
Common Course Assessment 2011 2012.pdf	131.215 KB	10/28/2011
Course Mastery Exam.pdf	192.268 KB	10/28/2011
E studio Study_Analyses summary 11222011.pdf	46.777 KB	1/8/2012
ENC Rubric Standardization Agenda.pdf	48.606 KB	3/5/2012
ENC Rubric Standardization Data _Correlations_1.pdf	109.304 KB	3/5/2012
ENC Rubric Standardization Data _Correlations_2.pdf	112.908 KB	3/5/2012
ENC Rubric Standardization Data _Correlations_3.pdf	109.123 KB	3/5/2012
ENC Rubric Standarization Feedback.pdf	67.909 KB	3/5/2012
ENC Rubric Standarization SignIn.pdf	225.462 KB	3/5/2012
ENC_1101_Success_Rates_Writing.pdf	66.99 KB	12/16/2011
Minutes_College_Prep_District_Meeting_01042012.pdf	297.749 KB	3/5/2012
Minutes_College_Prep_District_Meeting_090920111.pdf	647.624 KB	10/1/2011
Minutes_College_Prep_Faculty_Meeting_111811.pdf	251.025 KB	11/29/2011
Minutes_CrossDepartment_Developmental_English_English_Department_120711.pdf	189.766 KB	1/8/2012
Minutes_Developmental_Studies_District_Meeting_02102012.pdf	243.386 KB	3/5/2012
ttest_output_Success_Rates_Through_Summer_2011.pdf	101.919 KB	1/11/2012

Academic Discipline/Program Assessment Plan Template
Edison State College

(This template is for the Student Assessment Committee approval process; all assessments will be included in the respective Unit Plans.)

Academic Year of Implementation: 2011-2012
Academic Discipline/Program: College Prep/Developmental Studies

General Information

Discipline/Program	College Prep/Developmental Studies
Planning Team Leader(s) (names, campus, E-mail addresses)	Dr. Caroline Seefchak, Department Chair, Lee, cseefchak@edison.edu Dr. Eileen DeLuca, Associate Dean, Lee, ecdeluca@edison.edu
Planning Team Members (names, campus, E-mail addresses)	Dr. Jennifer Grove, Lee, jgrove@edison.edu Roberta Moore, Collier, moore6@edison.edu Amanda Pollitt, Hendry/Glades, apollitt@edison.edu Drew Macy, Lee, dmmacy@edison.edu

Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators

Student Learning Outcomes (Program or Discipline Specific)

Target Outcome(s) with the Course, Program, or Student Activity: Students will write at the post-secondary level that correlates with college success by completion of the developmental English sequence.

Performance Indicators for the Learning Outcome Selected:

Students will be rated as excellent, above average, average, or needs work, on the following elements of essay writing:

- Introductory paragraph
- Supporting paragraphs
- Organization
- Concluding paragraph
- Grammar
- Mechanics: Spelling, punctuation, title denotation
- Format: Indentations, spacing, margins, MLA documentation

Outcome Specific Goal: During the 2011-2012 academic year, 80% of ENC 0025 completers will receive 75% or higher on the common course assessment (essay) as scored on a rubric.

Common Assessment (What assessment method will you use to assess student ability related to the program/course outcome(s) selected?):

- Argumentative/Persuasive Five-Paragraph Essay Assignment
- College Prep English Essay Rubric

Description of the Proposed Common Assessment (they should be designed to ensure a balance between the need for consistency and the need for reasonable flexibility in order to encourage faculty judgment in the design and delivery of the learning activities):

Students will write argumentative or persuasive essays that will be evaluated for documentation as well as structure, development/support, coherence, and unity according to the common departmental rubric.

See attached College Prep Argumentative Research Paper Guidelines

Proposed Assessment Instrument: Essays will be scored using a common rubric developed by College Prep English faculty. See attached College Prep English Essay Rubric.

Implementation Process:

Approval Process:

Activities Associated with the Approval of Assessment Plans	**Completion Date**	**Person Responsible**	**Action Taken**
Draft assessment plan is agreed upon by reviewers appropriate to the program/discipline.	**09-13-2011**	**Dr. DeLuca**	**Approved**
Draft assessment plan is reviewed by Assessment Project Subcommittee (including Chair and VPAA).			
Assessment plan is initiated (with any necessary funding).*	**In process**	**Dr. Seefchak**	

Assessment plan data is collected.	**In process**	**Dr. Seefchak**	

Collection of Student Artifacts:

What information needs to be communicated to the students concerning the assessment process? - Students will be given copies of the College Prep Argumentative Research Paper Guidelines. - Students will be given copies of the College Prep Essay Rubric. - Within each instructor's syllabus, students are notified of the weight given to the required academic essay. All instructors of ENC 0025 will assign this essay.
How will student artifacts be collected? Is this a random sample? - All instructors of ENC 0025 will assign, collect, and score essays on a rubric. Scores will be submitted to the College Prep Assessment Clerk to be entered in a data base. - This is the first time a common rubric will be used for this course. This semester will serve as a pilot. During this semester, we will conduct a norming study on our rubric. A subset of randomly selected essays will be scored by two raters in an attempt to establish inter-rater reliability. - The IRPE Office will be asked to choose random sections for the norming study.
How will faculty associated with this assessment be informed about participation? - Faculty were informed of their participation in this assessment during district faculty meetings as well as through emails sent by Dr. Jennifer Grove.
Who is responsible for coordinating the artifacts? When will the artifacts be collected? - After the random sections are established, those faculty will be notified. They will be asked to submit

copies of ungraded essays to the College Prep Assessment Clerk. The Clerk will remove any identifying information about the students while assigning each essay a code or number. At an assigned date and time, scoring team members will rate the essays, using at least two raters per essay. Ratings will be recorded for inter-rater analysis.

When will the results be analyzed?

- After the norming study is completed, the assessment team members and the English Department Chair will meet to review the results and discuss any revisions needed to the assignment guidelines and/or the rubric.
- After all faculty submit scores for the essays they graded, the results will be compared to the results of the norming study. Results will be analyzed on a criterion by criterion basis so that faculty can effectively ascertain students' strengths and weaknesses in the essay development process. The assessment team will discuss the results and make any necessary revisions to be reported at the first faculty meeting in Spring 2012.

Improvement Plan and the Use of Assessment Results

What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes/improvements needed within the curriculum/program?

To Be Determined

What changes to the common course outlines, if any, need to be considered?

To Be Determined

What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes/improvements to the assessment process? To Be Determined
What are any other improvements that should be implemented as a result of this assessment? To Be Determined

**Assessment projects in high-impact courses received a stipend for the coordinator of that assessment; scorers for General Education artifacts receive a small stipend, as well.*

Common Course Assessment

Argumentative Research Paper

Florida State Competencies being assessed

1. Establish a thesis that addresses the specific task and audience
2. When writing arguments, students must establish a substantive claim
3. **Gather the information needed to build an argument, provide an explanation, or address a research question**
4. Create a logical progression of ideas or events, and convey the relationships among them
5. Sustain focus on a specific (topic or) argument
6. Support and illustrate arguments and explanations with relevant details, and examples
7. **When writing arguments, students must link claims and evidence with clear reasons, and ensure that the evidence is relevant and sufficient to support the claims**
8. When writing to inform or explain, students must convey information clearly and coherently
9. **When writing arguments, students must acknowledge competing arguments or information, defending or qualifying the initial claim as appropriate**
10. When writing to inform or explain, students must demonstrate understanding of content by reporting facts accurately
11. **Accurately incorporate source material into one's own wok while avoiding plagiarism**
12. Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard written English, including grammar, usage, and mechanics
13. Choose words and phrases to express ideas precisely and concisely
14. Recognizes effective transitional devices within the context of a passage

15. Develop and maintain a style and tone appropriate to the task, purpose, and audience
16. Assess the quality of one's own writing, and, when necessary, strengthen it through revision.

	Excellent	**Above Average**	**Average**	**Needs Work**
Introductory Paragraph	The lead in is thoughtfully developed with a clear transition to a focused thesis.	The lead in is developed with a clear transition to a focused thesis.	The lead in is not thoughtfully developed or the essay is missing a clear transition or a focused thesis.	There is no apparent lead in or the essay is missing a one-sentence thesis.
Supporting Paragraphs	Paragraphs clearly support the thesis and are well developed with no major problems in logic.	Paragraphs clearly support the thesis and are adequately developed with no major problems in logic.	Paragraphs support the thesis but may not be fully developed and/or may have problems in logic.	Paragraphs do not support the thesis, are underdeveloped, or are illogical.
Organization	Organization is clear to the reader and the essay follows MLA guidelines throughout.	Organization is clear to the reader but may not follow MLA guidelines within one or more paragraphs.	Organization may follow MLA guidelines but does not reveal sufficient planning.	Organization is unclear to the reader and/or does not follow MLA guidelines.
Concluding Paragraph	The summary is succinct, and the last sentence clearly closes the essay.	The last paragraph has both a summary and closure.	The thesis is repeated for the summary, but the closure is adequate.	The summary and/or closure is weak or missing.
Grammar	The writer demonstrates consistent command of higher level writing skills with sentence variety. Few, if any, errors exist, and errors do not interfere with readability.	The writer demonstrates a command of higher level writing skills with sentence variety. If errors exist, they do not interfere with readability.	The writer demonstrates knowledge of higher level writing skills with sentence variety, but errors may be numerous and interfere with readability.	The writer does not demonstrate a command of higher level writing skills with sentence variety, and errors interfere with readability.

Mechanics: **Spelling** **Punctuation** **Title denotation**	The writing demonstrates mastery of higher level writing skills, following MLA style mechanics.	The writing demonstrates mastery of higher level writing skills, following MLA style mechanics, but may have an error or two.	The writing attempts higher level writing skills, following MLA style mechanics, but may have errors in one or more area.	The writing shows little regard to MLA style mechanics.
Format: **Indentations** **Spacing** **Margins** **MLA documentation**	The paper conforms exactly to MLA format and documentation.	The paper conforms exactly to MLA format but documentation may be problematic.	The paper mostly conforms to MLA format but some documentation may be problematic.	The paper does not conform to MLA format and/or the documentation may be problematic or not present.

College Prep English Essay Rubric

Department of College Prep/Developmental Studies
Common Course Assessments

Common Course Assessment is an effective way to assess student learning. Student work samples are taken directly from the assignments or exams that they take in class as part of the course requirements.

This kind of assessment usually employs scoring rubrics, or guidelines developed by the faculty to create a match between the scoring methodology and the learning objectives that have been established for the course. Rubrics, once developed, should be normed by a group of faculty members.

The outcome of student performance on these assignments then becomes part of the assessment data.

Timeline

Spring 2011	Common Course Assessments are introduced to faculty; faculty meet and begin to create assessment and scoring pieces. - ENC faculty develops essay rubric - MAT faculty creates the performance tasks - EAP faculty develops essay rubric - REA faculty previewed standardized diagnostic and Lexile tests
Fall 2011	Faculty continue to develop Common Course Assessments - ENC faculty develops Argumentative/Persuasive Five-Paragraph Essay Assignment; a Course Level Assessment plan is submitted to SAC for approval - MAT faculty develop pilot rubrics for the performance tasks; faculty pilots assessments - ENC faculty will pilot assessments toward the end of the semester; faculty will meet to norm rubrics - EAP faculty will pilot assessments at the end of the term - REA faculty will continue to review standardized testing materials Data collected, reviewed, and analyzed to inform any changes for spring administrations.
Spring 2012	January: Disciplines will meet to make plans for Spring 2012 administrations of Common Course Assessments. - ENC faculty will administer the Common Course Assessment toward the end of the term. - MAT faculty will administer performance tasks and norm the rubrics - EAP faculty will administer the Common Course Assessment toward the end of the term and norm the rubrics. - REA faculty will pilot chosen exam.

Department of College Prep/Developmental Studies
Upper Level Course Mastery Exams and Lower Level Course Final Exams

Recent State legislation has eliminated the mandate that each student, placed in a developmental course, must take and pass a state exit exam. Under the new ruling, S.B. 1008.30, each college must create a means by which course mastery is demonstrated.
At Edison State College, the faculty in the Department of College Prep/Developmental Studies have been charged with creating Course Mastery Exams for upper level developmental classes, and Course Final Exams for lower level courses.

Guidelines

1. All faculty, district-wide, full-time and adjunct, must have the opportunity to give input.
2. Each exam must have an accompanying Table of Specifications:
    a. List the course competencies and the assigned item numbers on the exam that align with the competencies.
    b. Each competency should be assessed with at least one exam item.
    c. In order to enable item analysis, a Table of Specifications must be built for all forms of the exam; it is recommended that the Table of Specifications be applicable to all forms of the test.
3. We will share Upper Level exams with credit course faculty to ensure seamless curriculum transitions.
4. Weighting of exams must be a uniform policy and the same in all sections of any course.
5. Starting in the Spring 2012 Semester, all Course Mastery and Final exams in College Prep/Developmental Studies must be administered during the scheduled Final Exam Week.

Upper-level Developmental Classes **Mastery Exams for Fall 2011** (per Amendment to Section 1008.30 of the Florida Statutes)
MAT 0028 - Students will take a new 50-problem test as the course Mastery Exam. As in the past, students must score a minimum of 50% on it to pass the course. With a score of 50% or higher, the Mastery Exam score will count as 40% of the course grade.
REA 0017 – The former exit will be given as the course Mastery Exam, and it will count as 20% of the course grade.
ENC 0025 – The former exit will be used as a course Mastery Exam. Students must score a minimum of 65% on it to pass the course.

DEPARTMENT OF
COLLEGE PREP/DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

MINUTES

College Prep District Faculty Meeting
Friday, September 9, 2011
2:00 to 4:00 p.m. G231

In Attendance: Cynthia Baker, Karen Buonocore, Eileen DeLuca, Sabine Eggleston, Jennifer Grove, Rebecca Gubitti, Bert Lawrence, Melanie LeMaster, Jaime Marecz, Dorothy Marshall, Joseph Roles, Candace Rosene, Violeta Rotonda, Caroline Seefchak, Jessica Sobkowiak, Troy Tucker, Cathy Vache

I. Welcome

The meeting was opened by Dr. Caroline Seefchak, Department Chair, College Prep/Developmental Studies

Successes and Accomplishments

- Dr. Rebecca Gubitti shared how she used talk therapy and visualization to calm a student who was experiencing a seizure.
- Professor Karen Buonocore shared that the transition to being a full-time college professor was made easier by her supportive colleagues.
- Professor Renee Hester, and Dr. Eileen DeLuca will present together at the annual NADE conference in February.
- Dr. Rebecca Gubitti will present at the NADE conference.
- Professor Melanie LeMaster will present at the NADE conference.
- Dr. Caroline Seefchak will present at the NADE conference.

II. Legislature Amendment to 1008.30, FL Statutes

Upper-level Developmental Course Mastery Tests

An amendment to section 1008.30 of the Florida Statutes was passed, changing the mandate for state exit tests for developmental classes. Specifically, the requirement for a "passing score on a standardized … test," has been eliminated and has been replaced with a requirement that students "demonstrate successful mastery of the required developmental education competencies." Each discipline has been working to establish

district-wide policies concerning mastery of developmental courses. See the attached matrix of protocols for Fall 2011 Mastery Tests.

III. QEP News: Theoretical Framework Choice

Dr. Steve Atkins has asked each department in the College to adopt a Cornerstone corner, or theoretical framework, on which to base curricular plans for this academic year. This was discussed at the previous District Faculty Meeting, when faculty were asked to think about the frameworks and to prepare suggestions. At the meeting, the following definitions were used to open discussions of each of the four theoretical frameworks:

- **Critical Thinking** assists students in developing the skills of analysis and evaluation to improve thinking and guide attitudes and behavior.
- **Relevancy** promotes student engagement in learning activities that connect course content to each student's own academic and career objectives. Through purposeful connections and meaningful experiences, students will be guided toward successful completion of educational goals**.**
- **Applied Learning** enables students to reinforce skills learned in Cornerstone Experience by applying them in other classes and settings.
- **Success Strategies** help students achieve their personal and educational goals, acquire skills and knowledge, become more mature in their thinking, assume greater responsibility for their own lives and learning, and develop understanding of diversity and multiculturalism in preparation for the professional world**.**

Dr. Seefchak had sent a copy of the Cornerstone logo and a list of the frameworks to faculty prior to the meeting. During the meeting, the individual frameworks were discussed in detail. (see attached).

Dr. Grove suggested the use of Success Strategies, since the teaching of student skills is a part of every one of the developmental courses. Dr. Gubitti agreed. When discussion continued, it was a unanimous decision to use Success Strategies of the theoretical framework for College Prep/Developmental Studies.

Dr. Seefchak then led the faculty in a discussion of specific topics on which to base goals and objectives in order to formulate a unit plan. The faculty suggested:

- Time management
- Notebook usage - Organization
- IT (Instructional Technology) skills

Questions came up as to whether this will be a department-wide project, or if things may be done within the disciplines. Dr. Seefchak deferred to Dr. DeLuca, who explained

that it would be best and would work more as it is intended to work if we were to proceed with the unit plan as a department, rather than as separate disciplines.

IV. SAC: Common Course Assessments

Common Course Assessments begin this semester, as a pilot to next semester, when they will be required in all disciplines. The ENC discipline will use the Common Course Assessments in all classes, using a rubric designed by faculty members. The MAT discipline has specific activities and is working, this semester, on designing rubrics for measurement. EAP faculty have created rubrics and are finalizing assessments. REA faculty have examined the Pearson tests for use with students and are presently using a test made by Townsend Press.

Dr. Seefchak referred to a planning sheet that she and Dr. DeLuca had put together to map out how the Upper Level Developmental Writing classes would use random selection of classes and norming of papers to the rubric. Dr. DeLuca clarified the process and explained that all disciplines will submit rubrics to Ivon for data collection, but that English is the only discipline that will participate in the random selection for SAC. See attached worksheet that was read to faculty as an example of how the English discipline will handle Common Course Assessments this Fall 2011 semester.

V. College Prep/Developmental Studies Web Site

At a previous meeting, faculty were shown a page from one of the links to the College Prep/Developmental Studies Web site. At that time, they were told to consider items, links, handouts, or pages they would like included.

At this time, faculty were asked to please give specific items that are to be included as parts of links within the site. Examples were given, and faculty were reminded that items submitted to the College Prep/Developmental Studies Web site was those things that we want students to see and use. For example, Mathematics may include a link to the MyLabsPlus page and may also want to include a sheet that gives instructions for troubleshooting access difficulties.

Dr. Seefchak will be meeting with Daniel Stoeltzig, of IT, to get a mock-up of the Web site's landing page and to finalize the actual items to be included on the site.

VI. College Prep/Developmental Studies Folders on Document Manager

Course information, documents, and links that are intended for faculty use will be kept on the Document Manager. This can be accessed through the Portal. The Main folder is labeled **College Prep Department**. Sub-folders, at the present time, include:

- Adjunct Information
- English
- Mathematics
- Reading
- English for Academic Purposes

Dr. Seefchak has asked Discipline Curriculum Specialists to coordinate, with faculty members within their disciplines, the items they would like added to the Document Manager. Dr. Grove asked if folders may be added to the sub-folders. Yes, they may, but within reason. Adding folders makes the process more arduous and takes up more space on the server. Dr. Seefchak will be sending email reminders to Curriculum Specialists next week.

VII. PERT Diagnostic

Faculty were reminded that the Florida Council on Instructional Affairs has sent a memo, which was forwarded to faculty by Dr. Seefchak, that explains that the PERT Diagnostic will be open for preview by faculty between the dates of August 29 and September 23. In addition, several webinars are available. Please refer to the memo for more information. (Copy of memo attached.)

VIII. Final Exam Schedule and Final Exams

The Final Exam Schedule for Fall 2011 has been posted to the Edison State College site. Faculty were reminded to follow it and to make sure students are aware of dates and times of final exams.

IX. Logistics/Space - Room 223

Dr. Seefchak asked how the faculty liked the new space, space that is shared by full time and adjunct faculty as well as staff members of the College Prep/Developmental Studies department along with adjunct faculty members of the Mathematics and Science division of the School of Arts and Sciences. Consensus was that the space is very nice. Dr. Seefchak reminded everyone that the faculty space, as well as many other conveniences for us, were made possible by the hard work of our staff assistant Amanda Romero. It was suggested that faculty should take the time to thank Amanda for her assiduousness and tenacity in getting everything organized and keeping up with so much in order to make sure the move went smoothly and everyone has what he or she needs.

X. The Cornerstone Experience: A Listening Post

Guest speaker - Dr. Kevin Shriner

Dr. Shriner presented an overview of the Cornerstone Experience and Edison State College's Quality Enhancement Plan. A Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a course of action for institutional improvement that addresses one or more issues contributing to quality enhancement of student learning. Developing a QEP as a part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process is an opportunity to enhance overall institutional quality and effectiveness by focusing on an issue or issues that a college considers important to improving student learning. The primary goal of Edison State College's QEP is to enable first-time-in-college students to become self-reliant learners who apply critical thinking skills. The goal of new Cornerstone Experience three-credit course is to empower those students to enhance their learning and self-reliance by developing qualities and knowledge-based skills which will bolster their success at Edison and beyond. More information can be found on the Cornerstone Site: http://www.edison.edu/fye/qep.php

Dr. Shriner then discussed the Early Alert system and encouraged faculty to report students who have been absent or who appear to be struggling. Attendance policies were then discussed, and Dr. DeLuca and Dr. Seefchak both commented that a department-wide attendance policy will be discussed later in the semester.

Dr. Shriner then answered questions that were asked by College Prep/Developmental Studies faculty. Some questions had to do with teaching the course. Dr. Shriner explained that faculty should take the classes provided through the TLC for certification. Ten hours are needed in order to teach the class. He cautioned that not all those who meet the certification requirements will teach the class the first semester it is taught. The number of sections offered will grow each semester.

XI. Anything else

Faculty were reminded to give any shirts, for embroidery of the Edison State College logo, to Dr. Gubitti today. Thank you to Dr. Gubitti for coordinating this for the department.

Next District Faculty Meeting: Friday, October 14, 2:00 p.m., G 231

Attachments:

- Florida State Statutes Legislative Amendment to 1008.30
- Fall 2011 College Prep/Developmental Studies Mastery Exam Matrix
- Theoretical Framework Information for Cornerstone Experience Class
- SAC Worksheet for ENC Common Course Assessments, as read as an example, for Fall 2011

- Final Exam Schedule, Fall 2011
- Postsecondary Education Readiness Test Diagnostic Launch Memo

Exit exam legislation

…an amendment to section 1008.30 of the Florida Statutes was passed, changing the mandate for state exit tests for developmental classes. Specifically, the requirement for a "passing score on a standardized … test," has been eliminated and has been replaced with a requirement that students **"demonstrate successful mastery of the required developmental education competencies."**

Upper-level Developmental Classes **Mastery Exams for Fall 2011** (per Amendment to Section 1008.30 of the Florida Statutes)
MAT 0028 - Students will take a new 50-problem test as the course Mastery Exam. As in the past, students must score a minimum of 50% on it to pass the course. With a score of 50% or higher, the Mastery Exam score will count as 40% of the course grade.
REA 0017 – The former exit will be given as the course Mastery Exam, and it will count as 20% of the course grade.
ENC 0025 – The former exit will be used as a course Mastery Exam. Students must score a minimum of 65% on it to pass the course.

Cornerstone Experience:
Four Theoretical Constructs

The Cornerstone Experience logo is recommended by the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Committee based on a conceptual design by Edison State College student James Shears.

The **DIAMOND** duplicates the shape of the Edison State College logo, symbolizing quality of instruction.

The interlocking building blocks highlight the **four theoretical constructs** framing the Cornerstone Experience course.

- **Critical Thinking**
- **Relevancy**
- **Applied Learning**
- **Success Strategies**

The words **CORNERSTONE EXPERIENCE** cradle the bottom of the logo to signify the supportive foundation that the course provides.

The **COLORS** designate traits of successful learners

- **Red** - Fortitude, Determination
- **Green** - Optimism, Honesty
- **Yellow** - Intelligence, Confidence

- **Blue** - Reliability, Honor

The **TORCH** symbolizes the enlightenment of learning.

DRAFT

Academic Discipline/Program Assessment Plan Template Edison State College

(This template is for the Student Assessment Committee approval process; all assessments will be included in the respective Unit Plans.)

Academic Year of Implementation: 2011-2012
Academic Discipline/Program: College Prep/Developmental Studies

General Information

Discipline/Program	College Prep/Developmental Studies
Planning Team Leader(s) (names, campus, E-mail addresses)	Dr. Caroline Seefchak, Department Chair, Lee, cseefchak@edison.edu Dr. Eileen DeLuca, Associate Dean, Lee, ecdeluca@edison.edu
Planning Team Members (names, campus, E-mail addresses)	Dr. Jennifer Grove, Lee, jgrove@edison.edu Roberta Moore, Collier, Amanda Pollitt, Hendry/Glades, apollitt@edison.edu Drew Macy, Lee, dmmacy@edison.edu

Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators

Student Learning Outcomes (Program or Discipline Specific)

Target Outcome(s) with the Course, Program, or Student Activity: Students will write at the post-secondary level that correlates with college success by completion developmental English sequence.
Performance Indicators for the Learning Outcome Selected: Students will be rated as excellent, above average, average, or needs work, on the following elen writing: - Introductory paragraph - Supporting paragraphs - Organization

- Concluding paragraph
- Grammar
- Mechanics: Spelling, punctuation, title denotation
- Format: Indentations, spacing, margins, MLA documentation

Outcome Specific Goal: During the 2011-2012 academic year, 80% of ENC 0025 completers will
higher on the common course assessment (essay) as scored on a rubric.

**Common Assessment (What assessment method will you use to assess student ability r
program/course outcome(s) selected?):**

- Argumentative/Persuasive Five-Paragraph Essay Assignment
- College Prep English Essay Rubric

**Description of the Proposed Common Assessment (they should be designed to ensure a
between the need for consistency and the need for reasonable flexibility in order to enc
judgment in the design and delivery of the learning activities):**

Students will write argumentative or persuasive essays that will be evaluated for documentation a
structure, development/support, coherence, and unity according to the common departmental ru

See attached College Prep Argumentative Research Paper Guidelines

Proposed Assessment Instrument:

Essays will be scored using a common rubric developed by College Prep English faculty. See attac
English Essay Rubric.

Implementation Process:

Approval Process:

Activities Associated with the Approval of Assessment Plans	**Completion Date**	**Person Responsible**

Draft assessment plan is agreed upon by reviewers appropriate to the program/discipline.		
Draft assessment plan is reviewed by Assessment Project Subcommittee (including Chair and VPAA).		
Assessment plan is initiated (with any necessary funding).*		
Assessment plan data is collected.		

Collection of Student Artifacts:

What information needs to be communicated to the students concerning the assessmer - Students will be given copies of the College Prep Argumentative Research Paper Guidelines - Students will be given copies of the College Prep Essay Rubric. - Within each instructor's syllabus, students are notified of the weight given to the required a instructors of ENC 0025 will assign this essay.
How will student artifacts be collected? Is this a random sample? - All instructors of ENC 0025 will assign, collect, and score essays on a rubric. Scores will be College Prep Assessment Clerk to be entered in a data base. - This is the first time a common rubric will be used for this course. This semester will serve this semester, we will conduct a norming study on our rubric. A subset of randomly selecte scored by two raters in an attempt to establish inter-rater reliability. - The IRPE Office will be asked to choose random sections for the norming study.
How will faculty associated with this assessment be informed about participation? - Faculty were informed of their participation in this assessment during district faculty meeti through emails sent by Dr. Jennifer Grove.
Who is responsible for coordinating the artifacts? When will the artifacts be collected? - After the random sections are established, those faculty will be notified. They will be asked ungraded essays to the College Prep Assessment Clerk. The Clerk will remove any identify about the students while assigning each essay a code or number. At an assigned date and members will rate the essays, using at least two raters per essay. Ratings will be recorded analysis.

When will the results be analyzed?

- After the norming study is completed, the assessment team members and the English Dep
  meet to review the results and discuss any revisions needed to the assignment guidelines a
- After all faculty submit scores for the essays they graded, the results will be compared to t
  norming study. Results will be analyzed on a criterion by criterion basis so that faculty can
  ascertain students' strengths and weekness in the essay development process. The assessr
  discuss the results and make any necessary revisions to be reported at the first faculty me
  2012.

Improvement Plan and the Use of Assessment Results

**What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes/improvements nee
curriculum/program?**

What changes to the common course outlines, if any, need to be considered?

**What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes/improvements to t
process?**

What are any other improvements that should be implemented as a result of this asses

**Assessment projects in high-impact courses received a stipend for the coordinator of that assessment; scorers for General Education artifacts receive a small stipend, as well.*

FALL 2011 FINAL EXAM SCHEDULE

Abbreviations: M=Mon, T=Tue, W=Wed, R =Thur, F=Fri

For Classes Meeting At This Time The Final Exam Will Be Held

8:00 a.m. TR 8:00 a.m. – 9:50 a.m., Tuesday, December 6
8:00 a.m., MWF 8:00 a.m. – 9:50 a.m., Friday, December 2
8:00 a.m., MW 8:00 a.m. – 9:50 a.m., Wednesday, December 7
9:00 a.m. or 9:30 a.m., MWF 10:00 a.m. – 11:50 a.m., Friday, December 2
9:00 a.m. or 9:30 a.m., MW 9:00 a.m. – 10:50 a.m., Monday, December 5
9:00 a.m. or 9:30 a.m., TR 10:00 a.m. – 11:50 a.m., Tuesday, December 6
10:00 a.m., MW; MWF 10:00 a.m. – 11:50 a.m., Wednesday, December 7
11:00 a.m. , MW ; MWF 11:00 a.m. – 12:50 p.m., Monday, December 5
11:00 a.m. or 11:30 a.m. MTR 11:00 a.m. – 12:50 p.m., Monday, December 7
11:00 a.m. or 11:30 a.m. TR, 11:00 a.m. – 12:50 p.m., Thursday, December 8
12:00 p.m. or 12:30 p.m., MTR 12:00 p.m. – 1:50 p.m., Tuesday, December 6
12:00 p.m. or 12:30 p.m., MW: MWF 12:00 p.m. – 1:50 p.m., Wednesday, December 7
12:00 p.m. or 12:30 p.m., TR 12:00 p.m. – 1:50 p.m., Tuesday, December 6
1:00 p.m. or 1:30 p.m., MW; MWF 1:00 p.m. – 2:50 p.m., Monday, December 5
1:00 p.m. or 1:30 p.m., TR or R 1:00 p.m. – 2:50 p.m., Thursday, December 8
2:00 p.m. or 2:30 p.m., MW; MWF; 2:00 p.m. – 3:50 p.m., Wednesday, December 7
2:00 p.m. or 2:30 p.m., TR 2:00 p.m. – 3:50 p.m., Tuesday, December 6
3:00 p.m., MW or MWF 3:00 p.m. – 4:50 p.m., Monday, December 5
3 :00 p.m. or 3:30 p.m., TR 3:00 p.m. – 4:50 p.m., Thursday, December 8
4:00 p.m., 4:30 p.m., or 5:00 p.m.; MW; MWF 4:30 p.m. – 6:20 p.m., Wednesday, December 7
4:00 p.m., 4:30 p.m., or 5:00 p.m.; TR 4:30 p.m. – 6:20 p.m., Tuesday, December 6
Monday only day or night classes or MW night classes During class times on December 5
Tuesday only day or night classes or TR night Classes During class times on December 6
Wednesday only day or night classes During class times on December 7
Thursday only day or night classes During class times on December 8
Friday only classes During class times on December 2
Saturday only classes During class times on December 3

If you are teaching a class which is not covered by this schedule, you may use your final class period
for your final exam or make other accommodations acceptable to your class and to your Dean. T**here**
are no finals scheduled for Friday, December 9 because that is graduation night.

Grades are due from faculty by 4:30 PM on Friday, December 9, 2011

From: "Bilsky, Judith" <Judith.Bilsky@fldoe.org>
To:

Subject: Postsecondary Education Readiness Test Diagnostic Faculty Testing Window- IMPT!

Colleagues--The Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) Lower Level Diagnostic launched on August 10, 2011 and, as stated in my August 8th memorandum (attached for reference), McCann Associates has agreed to offer a no cost testing window for faculty to preview the assessment. Several colleges requested an extension to the survey close date to allow time for returning faculty to respond. As a result, the faculty testing window has been adjusted; it will begin September 12, 2011 and close on October 14, 2011. McCann Associates will provide the designated test administrator for each college with the usernames and passwords for the survey respondents. A small number of additional usernames and passwords will also be supplied in case there are others interested that did not have an opportunity to respond to the survey. These no cost units for faculty preview must be administered in a testing center.

In addition to trying out the P.E.R.T. Diagnostic, McCann Associates will host several webinars to introduce the assessments. There will be three webinars for developmental education faculty – reading, writing and mathematics. There will be additional webinars for testing coordinators/administrators as well as one geared towards academic and student affairs deans and vice presidents. The schedule and registration links for these webinars are below.

Reading: September 21, 2011, 10:30 a.m. (EDT) – 11:30 a.m.
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/173266985

Writing: September 21, 2011, 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/199099433

Mathematics: September 21, 2011, 2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/351531120

Testing Coordinators/Administrators: September 22, 2011, 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/312052137

Academic and Student Affairs: September 23, 2011, 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/365287504

The purpose of the webinars is to provide a general overview of the P.E.R.T. Diagnostics and guide participants through the functionality and reporting. Each of the webinars will

be recorded and available to those unable to participate.

McCann Associates has also developed the attached guide to the P.E.R.T. Diagnostics for faculty and administrators. We hope you find this a useful tool.

The P.E.R.T. Upper Level Diagnostics are on schedule for launch this fall --- more details to come. Thank you for your continued support and feedback as the full P.E.R.T. assessment system goes online. Questions may be directed to me or John Hughes at john.hughes@fldoe.org or Julie Alexander at julie.alexander@fldoe.org.

Please forward/share this information as appropriate!

Thanks,

Judy

Judith Bilsky, Ed.D.
Executive Vice Chancellor
Division of Florida Colleges
Florida Department of Education
(850) 245-9452
judith.bilsky@fldoe.org <mailto:judith.bilsky@fldoe.org>

"The Division of Florida Colleges is a dynamic and responsive Department of Education team. We provide leadership and advocacy to promote education innovation and continuous improvement within The Florida College System, fueling economic development for the state of Florida and its citizens."

DEPARTMENT OF
COLLEGE PREP/DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

MINUTES

College Prep Faculty Meeting
Friday, November 18, 2011
11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
H 223

In attendance: Cynthia Baker, Karen Buonocore, Eileen DeLuca, Sabine Eggleston, Jennifer Grove, Rebecca Gubitti, Renee Hester, Bert Lawrence, Melanie LeMaster, Jaime Marecz, Dorothy Marshall, Joseph Roles, Candace Rosene, Troy Tucker, Cathy Vache

Guests in attendance: Amanda Romero, Monica Moore

I. Dr. DeLuca opened the meeting and asked faculty to share successes and accomplishments. Dr. Grove shared that the final exam for 0015 was finished. Professor Rosene gave a "thank-you" to the person who had been leaving her gifts. Professor Tucker shared the success of the EAP Fall Potluck dinner with over 80 students participating. Dr. DeLuca complimented Lucinda Nowall and Amanda Romero for pulling together the College Prep Bowling Party which was a lot of fun. Dr. DeLuca shared a final "success" that after a search, Monica Moore accepted the position of College Prep Director.

II. Monica Moore introduced herself to the faculty and shared some of her background experiences in the field of education. She shared with the faculty that she hopes to be a resource for them. In addition, she hopes to sit down with individual faculty to learn how the lab can support what they do in the classroom.

III. Amanda Romero gave an overview of the features of the new Biz Hub copier. She explained the use of the copy card.

IV. Dr. DeLuca reviewed the policy for class cancellation and coverage . She thanked the many faculty who were able to chip in and cover classes due to the emergent needs this semester.

If an instructor intends to be absent from a class, please send an email to include Dr. DeLuca, Amanda Romero and Ivon Lopez (or Renee Williams if the class is in the evening). It is

important to notify all three so that students can be properly notified. Faculty are encouraged to send an email to students as well if possible.

She explained that in order to provide appropriate instruction, classes should only be covered by qualified faculty within the same discipline as the absent professor. It is not appropriate for instructional assistants to cover the content of the class in absence of a teacher. However, in some limited emergent situations, it may be possible for an instructional assistant to provide proctoring or hand out materials. In these cases, faculty members need to make a request with Dr. DeLuca who will consult with Monica Moore about availability of instructional assistants. When seeking coverage in advance, please notify Dr. DeLuca. Dr. DeLuca needs to ensure appropriate personnel are covering classes, and ensure that in emergent situations that necessitate excessive coverage, substitute faculty are being appropriately compensated.

If an instructor has special directions to accompany a class cancellation (or request for partial coverage), please send an email to include Dr. DeLuca, Amanda Romero and Ivon Lopez (or Renee Williams if the class is in the evening).

If phoning in a request for an emergent issue, please don't assume a message left for one person will be received in less than a 24-hour period. If you have a need for cancellation or coverage at the last minute and Dr. DeLuca doesn't answer, call Amanda; if she doesn't answer call Ivon, etc.

In all cases, Dr. DeLuca should be notified in advance of a cancellation (barring emergent situations where it would be impossible for the faculty member to contact the department offices). In most cases, when an instructor is sick, it is most appropriate to cancel the classes. If illness would take a professor out of the class for more than two classes in a row, a substitute would need to be secured.

If a professor is attending a conference, it is reasonable to adjust a schedule accordingly and inform students of any work or projects they will engage in during the absence. Faculty cannot require students to attend a classroom or lab unless they are there to supervise them. Students can be encouraged to attend a lab to complete a "lab assignment," but if a qualified instructor is not present, it cannot be required. If faculty are seeking a "lab proctor" from an instructional assistant, Dr. DeLuca and Monica Moore must be consulted.

Rebecca asked about the schedule for the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. Dr. DeLuca said the College Calendar lists the College as closed for Thursday, Friday and Saturday only.

Cathy Vache asked about assessment center availability in the late evening hours. As per the assessment policy sent out earlier in the semester, students can be placed in the assessment

room, blinds up, and IA's can be asked to look in on them. Dr. Grove suggested that IA's collect and guard student's personal items other than the exam and writing instrument.

V. Dr. DeLuca asked each discipline to share progress on exams and common course assessments. In addition, she asked faculty to let her know how she could support them in this endeavor.

a. Math-Professor Marshall said that the professors have piloted the use of common course assessments in both levels. At least one of the common course assessments for MAT 0028 may need to be revised to better align with the Developmental course competencies. The two assessments for MAT 0018 seem to align with the competencies, but after faculty piloted them with the students, they realized one is too long. She said the rubrics that Professor Vache and Professor Buonocore created seemed to work well. Professor Marshall hopes to have a follow-up meeting with Math faculty during exams week to discuss the assessments and how to revise them for future semesters.

b. English-Dr. Grove discussed the ENC 0025 and ENC 0015 common course assessments. She noted that this term, only the ENC 0025 is being reviewed as part of the assessment study. She noted that the rubrics may undergo slight revisions based on discoveries made in the pilot phase. One version of the exam for 0015 has been completed. A second version will be created in the spring, so that for the spring administration, there is an "A" and "B" form. She will send out a survey to begin compiling ideas for the mastery exam for 0025.

c. Reading-Professor LeMaster shared that the Reading faculty had reviewed several options. Designing a reading exam is a bit more complicated as it involves finding reading passages at the appropriate level and may involve copyrights. Melanie explained that it is difficult to get all the faculty together for an extended period of time. Dr. DeLuca noted that if a non-duty day work-session was needed, she would petition for funding. Professor LeMaster asked if the State Exit Exam could be used in the spring. Dr. DeLuca explained that the state had asked that it not be administered after Spring 2012. Dr. DeLuca suggested the MyReadiness Test might be an option. Renee said that for the 0007 test, she was revising the final exam to add questions that addressed any competencies that weren't covered by the former exam.

d. EAP-Professor Tucker shared that the EAP consortium was just starting to hold discussions about creating course competencies. Currently, this is not standardized across the state. Professor Rotonda designed a rubric that would be piloted for a common course assessment in EAP 1640. Dr. DeLuca, Professor Tucker, Professor Rotonda, and Dr. Seefchak have scheduled a meeting to discuss EAP entrance and exit assessments.

Dr. DeLuca asked if all Curriculum Specialists had apprised Ivon Lopez of copying needs, etc. Professor Baker asked for some clarification about how materials would be received on Collier

Campus. Professor Marshall explained the A, B, C and D versions, and offered to take her to see Ivon Lopez after the meeting.

Professor Marshall asked about the PERT Diagnostic Exam. Dr. DeLuca said that the Assessment office still didn't have access to the test.

Professor Eggleston wanted to discuss the students misplaced by the PERT. Both she and Professor LeMaster expressed concerns about misplacement and alternative completions. Dr. DeLuca explained that at the Division of Florida Colleges Conference, Julie Alexander asked colleges to recognize that both the PERT and the Developmental Competencies are new, and it is best to hold off on allowing alternative completions. The issue will be discussed further in the spring Connections conference. Dr. DeLuca suggested that we continue to explore modularized curricular options such as emporium models to allow for expediting the completion of the developmental sequence for students who may have been misplaced.

VI. Dr. DeLuca discussed the fall surveys. She asked faculty to let developmental students know that they would be receiving two surveys via email. One focuses on the courses; the other focuses on the labs. Dr. DeLuca asked faculty to encourage students to complete the ANONYMOUS surveys, so that we could use their feedback toward program improvement. Dr. DeLuca suggested that the surveys be sent out earlier this semester (during or right before finals week). The lab survey would be sent out about two weeks later. Professor LeMaster suggested that professors could post the survey link in their courses or send via email. Dr. DeLuca will send out the survey link to any professors who wish to post it, but all students will still receive the survey link via email.

VII. Dr. DeLuca discussed the recent SACS COC visit. She thanked the faculty who participated in presenting to the SACS COC team, and those who participated in being interviewed by the SACS COC team. She noted the fourteen recommendations received from the SACS COC team and highlighted the recommendation related to 3.3.1.1-Institutional Effectiveness-Educational Programs. She discussed that while the college has made great gains in this area in the past year-and-a-half, the SACS COC team is looking back three years. Dr. DeLuca noted that College Prep is on the right track with its assessment efforts and as a department we will continue to engage in assessing our educational programs with both qualitative and quantitative data. We will continue to use data to drive program improvement.

VIII. Dr. DeLuca reminded faculty about the meeting on December 9 to be followed by a Holiday Potluck. She encouraged all faculty to join in the Potluck and the "White Elephant" gift exchange. Professor Marshall explained the College Prep version of the "White Elephant" gift exchange.

IX. Other-

a. Professor Roles expressed concern about the Final Exam schedule. Dr. DeLuca noted that the concern had been brought to both Dr. Beeson and Dr. Atkins and their offices continue to try to improve the schedule. Dr. DeLuca promised to bring the concern to Dr. Harrel.

b. Dr. Grove asked about the Faculty Evaluation Portfolio and if the guidelines were the same for faculty on their second comprehensive evaluation. Dr. DeLuca said that the guidelines posted on the document manager were applicable to all faculty due for comprehensive evaluation.

c. Dr. Gubitti raised a concern that when Drew Macy was absent there was no one to supervise students requiring accommodation. Dr. DeLuca promised to bring the concern to Dean Newell.

d. Professor Roles and others praised Amanda Romero, Professor Vache and all the participants for their creative and bountiful Thanksgiving basket.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca and Amanda Romero

Minutes

College Prep Developmental English and English Department

December 7, 2011, 2:00-3:30

H-206

In attendance: Dr. DeLuca, Dean, College Prep; Dr. Seefchak, Department Chair, College Prep; Dr. Grove, Curriculum Specialist, College Prep; Professor Ellie Bunting, Department Chair, English

1. Dr. DeLuca explained that the purpose of the meeting was to share cross-departmental ideas to aid in designing a meaningful mastery exam for developmental writing students. She also asked the group to discuss the new developmental course competencies and asked that Ellie share the English Department's perspective on "readiness" for ENC 1101.

2. Ellie discussed the need for students to be able to write paragraphs with unity and appropriate transitions. She talked about grammar expectations and the focus on teaching students to avoid fragments and run-ons. She noted that ENC 1101 students struggled with documentation of sources. Dr. Grove pointed out that the newly released Developmental Course Competencies required that students begin mastering the skill of documentation in ENC 0025. Ellie thought that it was good that it would be introduced at the developmental level, so that it could be further developed in ENC 1101. Ellie shared that students write three papers in ENC 1101 that require documenting sources. Ellie shared the idea for using grammarly.com as a tool for students to have their papers checked for grammar and appropriate documentation before submitting them.

3. The group discussed the mastery exam design process for ENC 0025. Dr. Seefchak explained that all full-time and adjunct faculty from all campuses must be given the opportunity to provide input to its design. Dr. Grove and Dr. Seefchak discussed the pros and cons of coupling a writing prompt with an objective test. Dr. Grove showed Ellie how she had designed a final exam for ENC 0015 in which each of the developmental course competencies was aligned to at least one item. Ellie supported adding a writing prompt for either a paragraph or an essay as part of the mastery exam for ENC 0025. She supported grading the response on a holistic rubric. She described a prompt that they give in ENC 1101 where the students write a self-reflective essay about their achievement across the semester. The group discussed the differences between time writing responses and process writing responses (such as the common course assessment essay).

4. Dr. Grove discussed eliminating the common course assessment if students would be providing a writing sample on the mastery exam. Dr. DeLuca suggested keeping both to allow for triangulated measures of achievement (common course assessment, mastery exam writing sample, success in ENC 1101).

4. The group discussed the next steps. In January department meetings the developmental English faculty would work together to discuss the ideas generated at today's meeting as a point of departure for designing the ENC 0025 exam.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

EDISON STATE COLLEGE

COLLEGE PREP/DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

MINUTES

College Prep District Faculty Meeting
Friday, February 10, 2012
2:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m.
H 200

In Attendance: Cynthia Baker, Karen Buonocore, Eileen DeLuca, Sabine Eggleston, Jennifer Grove, Rebecca Gubitti, Renee Hester, Bert Lawrence, Melanie LeMaster, Jaime Marecz, Monica Moore, Roberta Moore, Caroline Seefchak, Jessica Sobkowiak, Troy Tucker, Cathy Vache

I. Welcome

Successes and accomplishments
The Department members discussed that it was an accomplishment to have our students doing so well this semester.

II. Division update – Dean Dr. DeLuca

Coordinate, Collaborate, Share Governance
Dr. Eileen DeLuca, Dean, College and Career Readiness, gave a comprehensive Division Update, explaining how the reorganization that has resulted in two separate departments under the direction of one Dean. The Department of Developmental Studies will continue as it has and will be one of the departments under the new division. Also under the new division will be the departments of First Year Experience/Quality Enhancement Plan and Student Success. Under the new structure, Dr. DeLuca stressed the ongoing importance that we coordinate, collaborate, and share governance as we move forward.

III. Departmental data overview

Dr. Caroline Seefchak provided a brief overview of the department's unit planning using the online interface TEd/Spol. She explained that there are 13 unit objectives for our department this academic year, for which we provide monthly updates. We have recently submitted mid-year results. This is not done in a vacuum; it is a documentation of faculty involvement and is a reflection of all the work done by everyone. Dr. DeLuca and Dr. Seefchak are just the people who put in the data and information. Handouts of Planning Objective Reports, by discipline, were provided to faculty members to enhance the discussion.

Dr. DeLuca then discussed success rate data, include ENC 1101 success rates, MAT 1033 success rates, and EAP success rates. The group discussed areas where the success rates were lower than five-year goals, and future goals for success rates.

IV. Overview of eStudio study

Dr. DeLuca discussed a study done by the IRPE in which student success rates in eStudio, or emporium-structured courses were compared with traditional courses. There is no significant difference in student performance across the two modalities. The data suggests that both modalities lead to positive student performance. Based on these results, the faculty discussed additional emporium model offerings for REA and MAT in fall 2012.

V. "Adopting Success Strategies" data

During the fall 2011 semester, (5) 28% of full-time and (10) 16% of adjunct faculty members completed at least one of the workshops given in the TLC that are related to Student Success. Faculty were reminded that the professional development course, The Way I learn, will be given on the following dates: 2/14, 3:00; 2/29, 12:00

VI. Pathways partnership information

Edison State College is collaborating with Lee County Schools in the Pathways Partnership, a program through which students preparing to take the GED will have greater exposure to, and knowledge of, Edison and the various programs available here for student support. Professor Jaime Marecz, Dr. Rebecca Gubitti and Amanda Romero participated on a panel, Tuesday 1/31, to talk about the college and to answer questions.

VII. Go Higher! Get Accepted! Open House

On Monday, February 20, Edison State College will host an open house for prospective students. There will be a "Meet the Faculty" table where students will have the opportunity to interact with professors. Developmental Studies professors are encouraged to visit the table and donate from ten minutes to an hour of their time taking to high school students and their families about Edison.

VIII. District textbook committee

IX. Lab update – Director Monica Moore

X. Curriculum specialists update – Dr. Harrel, VPAA, asked us to keep the job description and the personnel the same for this semester. We will reexamine the roles at the end of this semester.

XI. Professional development survey –
to be released on Monday, Survey Monkey

XII. Assessments

Common course - ENC did standardization; interrater reliability results coming
Course final for lower level developmental
Course mastery for upper level developmental

XIII. NADE conference and NADE certification February 23-25

XIV. Summer class schedule – coming soon – possibly next week

XV. Anything else – discuss Dorothy's retirement

ENC 1101 Success Rates

Term	Tested into ENC 1101*			Did not test into ENC 1101		
	Total Enrolled	# Successful	% Successful	Total Enrolled	# Successful	% Successful
Fall 2005	1,821	1,370	75%	159	110	69%
Spring 2006	729	470	64%	162	107	66%
Summer 2006	291	230	79%	52	41	79%
Fall 2006	1,742	1,168	67%	163	117	72%
Spring 2007	735	486	66%	152	106	70%
Summer 2007	258	184	71%	79	53	67%
Fall 2007	1,884	1,237	66%	173	122	71%
Spring 2008	867	504	58%	225	140	62%
Summer 2008	330	232	70%	91	61	67%
Fall 2008	2,214	1,724	78%	238	177	74%
Spring 2009	978	622	64%	289	195	67%
Summer 2009	488	389	80%	135	114	84%
Fall 2009	2,518	1,735	69%	302	216	72%
Spring 2010	1,250	760	61%	410	289	70%
Summer 2010	556	419	75%	174	125	72%
Fall 2010	2,616	2,093	80%	368	251	68%
Spring 2011	1,302	799	61%	409	251	61%
Summer 1011	407	315	77%	162	130	80%

* Tested into ENC 1101 - students who have indicator Z as College Preparatory Completion Indicator in the same semester data

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Eileen DeLuca, Associate Dean of College Prep
Mary Myers, Dean of Professional Technical Studies
Ellie Bunting, Faculty Chair, E Studio

From: Kevin Coughlin, Dean IRPE
Larysa Rybak, Research Analyst

Date: November 22, 2011

RE: ENC 0020S and REA 0003S E-Studio Study

To this memo, I attached a series of 14 tables that comprise the results of a study that included the academic records from 1,101 students. To be included in this study, the students had to be enrolled in either ENC 0020S or REA0003S during the Fall 2010 Semester. For each student, we retrieved available information for the following: CPT (reading and writing) scores, exit exam (reading and writing) scores, ENC 0020S grades, REA 0003S grades, ENC 1101 grades, and ENC 1102 grades. We also collected information regarding the modality of instruction for ENC 0020S and REA 0003S. We retrieved all test scores from the Banner production table; course and grade information were collected from the state data tables.

Results Overview

1. The study yielded evidence that ENC 1101 performance is significantly correlated with student performance in College Prep reading and writing courses
2. The study yielded evidence that student performance in reading and writing exit exams are significantly related to their performances on the reading and writing portions of the CPT
3. The study did not yield evidence that student performance on exit exams were related to course modality
4. The study did not yield evidence that student performance in ENC 1101 was related to their performance on CPT or course modality

NOTE: All tests for significant relationships in these analyses are conducted at the alpha = .01 level. We adjusted the acceptable type I error rate (rejecting a true null hypothesis) for the following reasons:

1. *Different sample sizes for the groups being considered*
2. *Significant non-normality in data distributions (all outcome variables exhibited significant levels of skewness and kurtosis)*
3. *In many of the unbalanced, factorial analyses of variance, the smaller groups were contributing larger amounts of variability to the analyses*

The following outline summarizes the results (ordered by table number):

1. Table 1 – Sample Means
    a. Table provides sample means, standard deviations, minimum values, and maximum values for
        i. CPT (reading and writing) scores
        ii. Exit exam (reading and writing) scores
        iii. Numeric values for grades associated with student performance in ENC 0020S and REA 0003S
        iv. If the student has completed ENC 1101 or ENC 1102 after the Fall 2010 term, this table has means for the numeric values for grades in these classes
    b. Note 1: When used in a correlation matrix or as an outcome variable in the analyses of variance, the numeric values for grades were assigned in the following manner:
        i. A = 4
        ii. B = 3
        iii. C = 2
        iv. D = 1
        v. F, I, W, X = 0
    c. Note 2: When CPT scores are used as a predictor (or grouping) variable, they were grouped (roughly) by quartiles
        i. 1 = lowest quartile
        ii. 2 = second quartile
        iii. 3 = third quartile
        iv. 4 = highest quartile

2. Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 – Frequency distributions
    a. Table 2 is the frequency distribution for grades in REA 003S (Fall 2010)
        i. This table covers all sections
        ii. Includes 708 student grades
        iii. Highest grade was an A
        iv. The grade most frequently assigned was B
        v. 128 students did not complete the course successfully
    b. Table 3 is the frequency distribution for grades in ENC 0020S (Fall 2010)
        i. Table covers all sections
        ii. Includes 615 student grades
        iii. Highest grade was an A
        iv. The most frequently assigned grade was B
        v. 134 students did not complete the course successfully
    c. Table 4 is the frequency distribution for grades in ENC 1101
        i. This distribution is based on the students that were enrolled in either ENC 0020S or REA 003S during the Fall 2010 semester
        ii. Included 584 student grades
        iii. Highest grade was A
        iv. The most frequently assigned grade was B
        v. 153 students did not complete the course successfully
    d. Table 5 is the frequency distribution for grades in ENC 1102

i. This distribution is based on the students that were enrolled in either ENC 0020S or REA 003S during the Fall 2010 semester
ii. Included 70 student grades
iii. Highest grade was A
iv. The most frequently assigned grade was B
v. 11 students did not complete the course successfully

3. Table 6 – Correlation among numeric grade values
    a. Significant correlation exist between the following pairs of variables
        i. REA 0003S grades and ENC 0020S grades
        ii. REA 0003S grades and ENC 1101 grades
        iii. ENC 0020S grades and ENC 1101 grades
        iv. ENC 1101 and ENC 1102 grades
    b. The strongest correlation was between the ENC 1101 and the ENC 1102 grades
    c. The correlation between REA 0003S and ENC 0020S was the next strongest ($r = .66, p < .01$)

4. Table 7 - Means of outcome variables grouped by E-studio status (REA 0003S)
    a. Table provides group sample sizes, means, standard deviations, minimum values, and maximum values for
        i. CPT (reading and writing) scores
        ii. Exit exam (reading and writing) scores
        iii. Numeric values for grades associated with student performance in ENC 0020S and REA 0003S
        iv. If the student has completed ENC 1101 or ENC 1102 after the Fall 2010 term, this table has means for the numeric values for grades in these classes
    b. Student membership in a group is defined by the modality of their REA 0003S course; this grouping method included three levels
        i. E-studio = No
        ii. E-studio = Yes
        iii. E-studio is missing (these students were enrolled in ENC 0020S and not enrolled in REA 0003S during the Fall 2010 Semester)

5. Table 8 - Means of outcome variables grouped by E-studio status (ENC 0020S)
    a. Table provides group sample sizes, means, standard deviations, minimum values, and maximum values for
        i. CPT (reading and writing) scores
        ii. Exit exam (reading and writing) scores
        iii. Numeric values for grades associated with student performance in ENC 0020S and REA 0003S
        iv. If the student has completed ENC 1101 or ENC 1102 after the Fall 2010 term, this table has means for the numeric values for grades in these classes
    b. Student membership in a group is defined by the modality of their ENC 0020S course; this grouping method included three levels

i. E-studio = No
ii. E-studio = Yes
iii. E-studio is missing (these students were enrolled in REA 0003S and not enrolled in ENC 0020S during the Fall 2010 Semester)

6. Tables 9 and 10 – ANOVA summary table and follow-up comparisons
    a. To identify significant differences in student performance on the reading exit exam, we conducted an analysis of variance.
    b. The main effects for this analysis included the modality of reading instruction (E-studio versus traditional) and student performance on the reading CPT (students were grouped by quartile based on the CPT reading score distribution for the sample)
    c. Through this analysis, we also examined the data to determine if student exit score performance was related the interaction between course modality and CPT placement scores
    d. According to the results of the ANOVA, we did not have evidence suggesting that student performance on the exit exam was significantly related to course modality or the interaction between course modality and CPT reading score
    e. According to these results, student performance on the exit exam was significantly related to their performance on the CPT reading placement ($f = 11.94; p < .0001$)
    f. Table 10 provides information concerning the pair-wise comparisons where the differences between mean exit exam scores were significant

7. Tables 11 and 12 – ANOVA summary table and follow-up comparisons
    a. To identify significant differences in student performance on the writing exit exam, we conducted an analysis of variance.
    b. The main effects for this analysis included the modality of writing instruction (E-studio versus traditional) and student performance on the writing portion of the CPT (students were grouped by quartile based on the CPT writing score distribution for the sample)
    c. Through this analysis, we also examined the data to determine if student exit score performance was related the interaction between course modality and CPT placement scores
    d. According to the results of the ANOVA, we did not have evidence suggesting that student performance on the exit exam was significantly related to course modality or the interaction between course modality and CPT writing score
    e. According to these results, student performance on the exit exam was significantly related to their performance on the CPT writing placement ($f = 17.1; p < .0001$)
    f. Table 12 provides information concerning the pair-wise comparisons where the differences between mean exit exam scores were significant

8. Tables 13 and 14 – ANOVA summary tables
    a. Table 13 is a summary table for an ANOVA
        i. Outcome variable was the numeric equivalence of the ENC 1101 grade

ii. Grouping (predictor variables) included
    1. Course modality for REA 0003S(main effect)
    2. CPT Reading Score (quartile) (main effect)
    3. Interaction between the two main effects
iii. This ANOVA did not yield significant results; we do not have evidence that ENC 1101 performance is related to either main effects or the interaction effect

b. Table 13 is a summary table for an ANOVA
    i. Outcome variable was the numeric equivalence of the ENC 1101 grade
    ii. Grouping (predictor variables) included
        1. Course modality ENC 0020S (main effect)
        2. CPT Writing Score (quartile) (main effect)
        3. Interaction between the two main effects
    iii. This ANOVA did not yield significant results; we do not have evidence that ENC 1101 performance is related to either main effects or the interaction effect

Developmental Studies

ENC Rubric Feedback

January 28, 2012

Compiled feedback from all participants in the ENC Rubric Feedback Session

1. Please comment on how you believe the ENC Rubric worked for you in scoring essays today.

    - Often I found a category too restricting ex) Conclusion Level 2 gives the impression that a repeated thesis is the only issue to place in this category. Also, many of the descriptions under "Average" seemed below average. "missing thesis", organization category, "thesis repeated", "interfere with readability
    - Fairly well.
    - Most worked well. – Mechanics, org, and format were problem area.
    - Without Transitions.
    - Intro – separate Lead In/Thesis.
    - Too much emphasis is put on MLA; perhaps wording can be changed.
    - There was a fair amount of difficulty distinguishing between level 2 and 3 in many cases.

2. Looking at the levels on the Rubric, are any too similar? E.g., is a 4 too similar to a 3? Explain?

    - I suggest adding "Below Average" and "Insufficient"/or "Does not meet"
    - Should have MLA mentioned only in FORMAT.
    - No problems.
    - Sup paragraphs.
    - 4 and 3 are similar in Introductory Paragraph, Supporting Paragraphs, Organization, Concluding Paragraph⇨ actually, All.

- Use of word “succinct” under concluding paragraphs throws me off. Level “3” and “2” of “Format” criterion are worded too similar. The “3” distinction seems too harsh.
- Level “3” and “2” of “Format” are worded too similar “have an error or two” vs. “have errors in more than one area.”
- Level “2” of “Concluding Paragraph” doesn’t read well. The word “but” should indicate one part of the sentence is positive and one is negative… but both parts seem neutral. Perhaps the word “and” is more appropriate. Maybe take the word “exactly” out of the “Format” Level 3 performance level.

3. Examine the seven criteria listed. Is there any overlap; do you believe you may be scoring students more than once for the same criterion?

    - Mechanics & Grammar- (If this is done that would make a 5 point system easier to grade 5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, 1=F) Insert in # 5
    - Mechanics belonged broken into the grammar and format categories.
    - No.
    - Remove MLA from Mechanics.
    - There seems to be overlap in the grammar and writing criteria ‘The writing demonstrates mastery…” “Grammar” criterion focuses heavily on sentence variety?

4. In what ways would you change the Rubric for ease of use? Use the attached form to be specific?

    - Give more flexibility to descriptions, make for less perfection based.
    - Grammar & Syntax especially for ESOL students.
    - More specific detail in format/documentation.
    - Mechanics should be included with grammar.
    - Organization should not “Transitions”, “Logic”, and “Structure”.
    - “Plan of Dev.” Should be added to Intro paragraph.
    - Wording.
    - See changes on attached rubric.

- Format category does not specifically allow for no "use of documentation" as indicated by the assignment guidelines. In level "1" is does allow for "not present" but then it dismisses any other achievement of adherence to MLA guidelines.

5. Thinking about translating the Rubric into a grade, what weighing should be assigned to each individual criterion? Please provide specific examples of what you would do.

    - See (3)
    - Supporting paragraphs should have a greater weighting.
    - The above average area for grammar is strict and could be incorporated together with excellent (more realistic).
    - None.
    - I am for possibly making weighting up to individual instructors.
    - I would probably collapse grammar and mechanics into one category and then have MLA style + documentation be another. You may want to consider embedding 'uses appropriate sources to develop argument" into the supporting paragraphs criterion.
    - Question: how is plagiarizing being handled? How is overuse of source material being handled/even if it is documented?

6. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about the Rubric as a toll for scoring Developmental English essays?

    - I would prefer a 5 column rubric which is comparable to grades.
    - A question… I see the use of in-text citation, but are students expected to have a "works cited" page?
    - What level of in-text documentation is expected?
    - I don't like the wording of Level 2 for "Introductory Paragraph". I don't like the beginning statement "The lead is not thoughtfully…" could be rewritten in a positive language.
    - Does "MLA Style" need to appear both in "Mechanics" and Format"?
    - Are students expected to have an essay map? If so, should it appear in rubric?

Developmental Studies

English Discipline Rubric Standardization Meeting
Saturday, January 28, 2012, 9:00 – 12:00, H 223

Agenda and Guidelines

I. Participants (reviewer) to sign contracts

II. Overview of essay scoring process

A. Each reviewer will receive a stack of approximately fifty ENC 0025 essays and a stack of essay rubrics.
B. Use one rubric per essay.
C. On each rubric:
1. Where it says “Student,” instead write the student’s ID number for the paper with which that rubric will correspond.
2. Above where you write the student’s ID number, write your name.
3. Score each essay with a rubric.
a. You do not need to make corrections.
b. You do not need to provide feedback.
c. Be sure to mark one box in each of the seven categories.

III. Overview of rubric review process

As you are using the scoring rubric, make note of things that are listed on the Rubric Feedback sheet.
Please fill out the Rubric Feedback sheet, and turn it in with your materials at the end of the session.

IV. Conclusion of session

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

8 With Variables:	R4C1	R4C2	R4C3	R4C4	R4C5	R4C6	R4C7	R4Total
8 Variables:	R3C1	R3C2	R3C3	R3C4	R3C5	R3C6	R3C7	R3Total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R4C1	28	2.42857	0.69007	68.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R4C2	28	2.25000	0.64550	63.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R4C3	28	2.96429	0.69293	83.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R4C4	28	2.39286	0.91649	67.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R4C5	28	2.67857	0.72283	75.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R4C6	28	2.64286	0.55872	74.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R4C7	28	1.21429	0.41786	34.00000	1.00000	2.00000
R4Total	28	16.57143	2.89864	464.00000	8.00000	21.00000
R3C1	28	2.75000	1.04083	77.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R3C2	28	2.57143	0.87891	72.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R3C3	28	2.39286	0.95604	67.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R3C4	28	2.14286	0.84828	60.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R3C5	28	2.21429	0.68622	62.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R3C6	28	2.03571	0.74447	57.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R3C7	28	1.82143	0.77237	51.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R3Total	28	15.92857	4.82991	446.00000	7.00000	25.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 28
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	R3C1	R3C2	R3C3	R3C4	R3C5	R3C6	R3C7	R3Total
R4C1	0.56723	0.43619	0.35288	0.39771	0.26816	0.25748	0.42686	0.48736
	0.0016	0.0203	0.0655	0.0361	0.1677	0.1859	0.0235	0.0085
R4C2	0.26185	0.26113	0.37510	0.27056	0.29265	0.44316	0.39001	0.39797
	0.1783	0.1795	0.0492	0.1638	0.1307	0.0182	0.0402	0.0360
R4C3	0.29528	0.09556	0.35741	0.26104	0.48403	0.36154	0.26445	0.36440
	0.1271	0.6286	0.0619	0.1797	0.0091	0.0587	0.1739	0.0566
R4C4	0.41739	0.44666	0.53592	0.63974	0.62676	0.68435	0.67832	0.69267
	0.0271	0.0172	0.0033	0.0002	0.0004	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
R4C5	-0.06154	-0.16657	-0.02488	0.19847	0.21867	0.22860	0.02606	0.05683
	0.7558	0.3969	0.9000	0.3113	0.2636	0.2420	0.8953	0.7739
R4C6	0.09553	0.20472	0.27239	0.26793	0.40020	0.38797	0.27587	0.31959
	0.6287	0.2960	0.1608	0.1681	0.0348	0.0413	0.1553	0.0974
R4C7	0.04258	0.15847	-0.21853	-0.08956	-0.29524	-0.26363	-0.10656	-0.12060
	0.8297	0.4206	0.2639	0.6504	0.1272	0.1752	0.5894	0.5410
R4Total	0.40511	0.34683	0.43722	0.50783	0.53200	0.55657	0.51047	0.56915
	0.0325	0.0706	0.0200	0.0058	0.0036	0.0021	0.0055	0.0016

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

8 With Variables:	R6C1	R6C2	R6C3	R6C4	R6C5	R6C6	R6C7	R6Total
8 Variables:	R5C1	R5C2	R5C3	R5C4	R5C5	R5C6	R5C7	R5Total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R6C1	20	2.15000	0.67082	43.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R6C2	20	2.00000	0.56195	40.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R6C3	20	2.35000	0.93330	47.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R6C4	19	1.57895	0.69248	30.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R6C5	20	2.15000	0.74516	43.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R6C6	20	2.15000	0.58714	43.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R6C7	20	2.00000	0.79472	40.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R6Total	20	14.30000	3.90816	286.00000	7.00000	21.00000
R5C1	20	2.25000	0.44426	45.00000	2.00000	3.00000
R5C2	20	2.55000	0.51042	51.00000	2.00000	3.00000
R5C3	20	2.35000	0.67082	47.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R5C4	19	2.36842	0.59726	45.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R5C5	20	2.60000	0.68056	52.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R5C6	20	2.85000	0.74516	57.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R5C7	20	2.40000	0.82078	48.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R5Total	20	17.25000	3.07580	345.00000	11.00000	21.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0
Number of Observations

	R5C1	R5C2	R5C3	R5C4	R5C5	R5C6	R5C7	R5Total
	0.39736	0.36123	0.22807	0.32001	0.59949	0.57384	0.36324	0.54205
	0.0828	0.1176	0.3335	0.1817	0.0052	0.0082	0.1154	0.0136
R6C1	20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20
	0.42164	0.55048	0.55847	0.42021	0.68810	0.50276	0.45644	0.66990
	0.0641	0.0119	0.0105	0.0732	0.0008	0.0239	0.0431	0.0012
R6C2	20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20
	0.53948	0.56899	0.63469	0.65693	0.64633	0.68489	0.49468	0.79296
	0.0141	0.0088	0.0026	0.0022	0.0021	0.0009	0.0266	<.0001
R6C3	20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20
	0.72799	0.41620	0.34571	0.37210	0.47534	0.23475	0.28976	0.47713
	0.0004	0.0763	0.1471	0.1284	0.0397	0.3333	0.2289	0.0389
R6C4	19	19	19	18	19	19	19	19
	0.19873	0.46357	0.31061	0.28545	0.74725	0.32701	0.41306	0.53390
	0.4009	0.0395	0.1826	0.2362	0.0002	0.1593	0.0703	0.0153
R6C5	20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20
	0.25222	0.41271	0.26057	0.37119	0.68492	0.41502	0.41501	0.53187
	0.2834	0.0705	0.2672	0.1177	0.0009	0.0688	0.0688	0.0158
R6C6	20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20
	0.29814	0.64875	0.49362	0.45569	0.48656	0.44438	0.64550	0.73207
	0.2017	0.0020	0.0270	0.0499	0.0296	0.0496	0.0021	0.0002
R6C7	20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20
	0.53049	0.65170	0.54003	0.59166	0.79945	0.61267	0.60052	0.82095
	0.0161	0.0019	0.0140	0.0076	<.0001	0.0041	0.0051	<.0001
R6Total	20	20	20	19	20	20	20	20

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

8 With Variables:	R2C1	R2C2	R2C3	R2C4	R2C5	R2C6	R2C7	R2Total
8 Variables:	R1C1	R1C2	R1C3	R1C4	R1C5	R1C6	R1C7	R1Total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R2C1	25	2.72000	0.67823	68.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R2C2	25	2.16000	0.55377	54.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R2C3	25	2.92000	0.75939	73.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R2C4	25	2.60000	0.76376	65.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R2C5	25	2.36000	0.81035	59.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R2C6	25	2.36000	0.56862	59.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R2C7	25	2.04000	0.88882	51.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R2Total	25	17.16000	3.76032	429.00000	11.00000	26.00000
R1C1	25	2.16000	1.06771	54.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C2	25	2.12000	0.83267	53.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C3	25	2.88000	1.20139	72.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C4	25	2.00000	1.15470	50.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C5	25	2.60000	0.86603	65.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C6	25	2.20000	1.08012	55.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C7	25	1.36000	0.63770	34.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R1Total	25	15.32000	4.46953	383.00000	7.00000	25.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 25
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	R1C1	R1C2	R1C3	R1C4	R1C5	R1C6	R1C7	R1Total
R2C1	0.69736	0.35710	0.41727	0.31922	0.43982	0.42089	0.33910	0.66306
	0.0001	0.0797	0.0380	0.1198	0.0278	0.0362	0.0973	0.0003
R2C2	0.30725	0.22771	0.46846	0.26064	0.39965	0.08359	0.06607	0.41614
	0.1352	0.2736	0.0182	0.2083	0.0478	0.6912	0.7537	0.0385
R2C3	0.42756	0.47708	0.67411	0.28511	0.13939	0.47751	0.32007	0.63394
	0.0330	0.0159	0.0002	0.1671	0.5064	0.0158	0.1188	0.0007
R2C4	0.33723	0.40621	0.39960	0.33072	0.37796	0.45457	0.47907	0.60053
	0.0992	0.0439	0.0478	0.1064	0.0625	0.0224	0.0154	0.0015
R2C5	0.12328	0.24206	0.30302	-0.04453	0.62935	0.29514	0.14191	0.35801
	0.5571	0.2437	0.1409	0.8326	0.0008	0.1521	0.4986	0.0789
R2C6	0.17569	0.25697	0.43183	0.00000	0.38922	0.28493	0.08733	0.36265
	0.4009	0.2150	0.0311	1.0000	0.0545	0.1674	0.6781	0.0748
R2C7	0.21250	0.04954	0.23880	-0.04060	0.18404	0.33853	0.12056	0.24837
	0.3078	0.8141	0.2503	0.8472	0.3785	0.0979	0.5659	0.2313
R2Total	0.42923	0.37953	0.54859	0.20152	0.48108	0.46369	0.30512	0.62157
	0.0323	0.0613	0.0045	0.3341	0.0149	0.0196	0.1380	0.0009

EDISON STATE COLLEGE

Developmental Studies

English Discipline Rubric Standardization Meeting
Saturday, January 28, 2012, 9:00 – 12:00, H 223

Sign-In Sheet

Name	Signature
Professor Drew Macy	
Professor Amanda Pollitt	
Dr. Jennifer Grove	
Dr. Eileen DeLuca	
Professor Roberta Moore	
Dr. Caroline Seefchak	

The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: rate

Moments

N	36	Sum Weights	36
Mean	0.65	Sum Observations	23.4
Std Deviation	0.07034608	Variance	0.00494857
Skewness	0.34257242	Kurtosis	-0.0207297
Uncorrected SS	15.3832	Corrected SS	0.1732
Coeff Variation	10.8224743	Std Error Mean	0.01172435

Basic Statistical Measures

Location		Variability	
Mean	0.650000	Std Deviation	0.07035
Median	0.640000	Variance	0.00495
Mode	0.650000	Range	0.31000
		Interquartile Range	0.08500

Tests for Location: Mu0=0

Test	-Statistic-		-----p Value------	
Student's t	t	55.44019	Pr > |t|	<.0001
Sign	M	18	Pr >= |M|	<.0001
Signed Rank	S	333	Pr >= |S|	<.0001

Tests for Normality

Test	--Statistic---		-----p Value------	
Shapiro-Wilk	W	0.967572	Pr < W	0.3630
Kolmogorov-Smirnov	D	0.138889	Pr > D	0.0785
Cramer-von Mises	W-Sq	0.087333	Pr > W-Sq	0.1644
Anderson-Darling	A-Sq	0.516008	Pr > A-Sq	0.1866

Quantiles (Definition 5)

Quantile	Estimate
100% Max	0.800
99%	0.800
95%	0.780
90%	0.760
75% Q3	0.690
50% Median	0.640
25% Q1	0.605

The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: rate

Quantiles (Definition 5)

Quantile	Estimate
10%	0.570
5%	0.550
1%	0.490
0% Min	0.490

Extreme Observations

----Lowest----		----Highest---	
Value	Obs	Value	Obs
0.49	14	0.75	24
0.55	5	0.76	9
0.56	2	0.78	3
0.57	35	0.78	27
0.59	26	0.80	21

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rate

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
mat	18	0.6544	0.0669	0.0158	0.5700	0.8000
tested	18	0.6456	0.0753	0.0178	0.4900	0.7800
Diff (1-2)		0.00889	0.0712	0.0237		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean		Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev	
mat		0.6544	0.6212	0.6877	0.0669	0.0502	0.1003
tested		0.6456	0.6081	0.6830	0.0753	0.0565	0.1129
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.00889	-0.0394	0.0571	0.0712	0.0576	0.0933
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.00889	-0.0394	0.0572			

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > |t|
Pooled	Equal	34	0.37	0.7104
Satterthwaite	Unequal	33.531	0.37	0.7105

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	17	17	1.27	0.6296

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
group	2	mat tested

Number of Observations Read 36
Number of Observations Used 36

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: rate

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	1	0.00071111	0.00071111	0.14	0.7104
Error	34	0.17248889	0.00507320		
Corrected Total	35	0.17320000			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	rate Mean
0.004106	10.95791	0.071226	0.650000

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
group	1	0.00071111	0.00071111	0.14	0.7104

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
group	1	0.00071111	0.00071111	0.14	0.7104

The GLM Procedure

Level of group	N	rate Mean	rate Std Dev
mat	18	0.65444444	0.06688201
tested	18	0.64555556	0.07532067

The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: rate

Moments

N	36	Sum Weights	36
Mean	0.65	Sum Observations	23.4
Std Deviation	0.07034608	Variance	0.00494857
Skewness	0.34257242	Kurtosis	-0.0207297
Uncorrected SS	15.3832	Corrected SS	0.1732
Coeff Variation	10.8224743	Std Error Mean	0.01172435

Basic Statistical Measures

Location		Variability	
Mean	0.650000	Std Deviation	0.07035
Median	0.640000	Variance	0.00495
Mode	0.650000	Range	0.31000
		Interquartile Range	0.08500

Tests for Location: Mu0=0

Test	-Statistic-		-----p Value------	
Student's t	t	55.44019	Pr > |t|	<.0001
Sign	M	18	Pr >= |M|	<.0001
Signed Rank	S	333	Pr >= |S|	<.0001

Tests for Normality

Test	--Statistic---		-----p Value------	
Shapiro-Wilk	W	0.967572	Pr < W	0.3630
Kolmogorov-Smirnov	D	0.138889	Pr > D	0.0785
Cramer-von Mises	W-Sq	0.087333	Pr > W-Sq	0.1644
Anderson-Darling	A-Sq	0.516008	Pr > A-Sq	0.1866

Quantiles (Definition 5)

Quantile	Estimate
100% Max	0.800
99%	0.800
95%	0.780
90%	0.760
75% Q3	0.690
50% Median	0.640
25% Q1	0.605

The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: rate

Quantiles (Definition 5)

Quantile	Estimate
10%	0.570
5%	0.550
1%	0.490
0% Min	0.490

Extreme Observations

----Lowest----		----Highest---	
Value	Obs	Value	Obs
0.49	14	0.75	24
0.55	5	0.76	9
0.56	2	0.78	3
0.57	35	0.78	27
0.59	26	0.80	21

The TTEST Procedure

Variable: rate

group	N	Mean	Std Dev	Std Err	Minimum	Maximum
read	18	0.7061	0.0590	0.0139	0.6100	0.8400
tested	18	0.7006	0.0713	0.0168	0.5800	0.8000
Diff (1-2)		0.00556	0.0655	0.0218		

group	Method	Mean	95% CL Mean		Std Dev	95% CL Std Dev	
read		0.7061	0.6768	0.7355	0.0590	0.0443	0.0885
tested		0.7006	0.6651	0.7360	0.0713	0.0535	0.1069
Diff (1-2)	Pooled	0.00556	-0.0388	0.0499	0.0655	0.0530	0.0858
Diff (1-2)	Satterthwaite	0.00556	-0.0389	0.0500			

Method	Variances	DF	t Value	Pr > |t|
Pooled	Equal	34	0.25	0.8006
Satterthwaite	Unequal	32.85	0.25	0.8006

Equality of Variances

Method	Num DF	Den DF	F Value	Pr > F
Folded F	17	17	1.46	0.4431

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
group	2	read tested

Number of Observations Read 36
Number of Observations Used 36

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: rate

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	1	0.00027778	0.00027778	0.06	0.8006
Error	34	0.14572222	0.00428595		
Corrected Total	35	0.14600000			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	rate Mean
0.001903	9.308126	0.065467	0.703333

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
group	1	0.00027778	0.00027778	0.06	0.8006

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
group	1	0.00027778	0.00027778	0.06	0.8006

The GLM Procedure

Level of group	rate N	rate Mean	rate Std Dev
read	18	0.70611111	0.05902531
tested	18	0.70055556	0.07132958