

COLLEGE-WIDE ACADEMIC AND STUDENT SUPPORT COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2004
WOLFSON CAMPUS –ROOM 3210 – 1:30 P.M.
MINUTES

CHAIR: Ian Cobham

MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Juan Abascal | Maria Alvarez |
| Toni Bilbao | Shirly Ferguson |
| Armando Ferrer | Karen Hays |
| Harry Hoffman | Malou Harrison |
| Susan Kah | Michael Kaldor |
| Ece Karayalcin | Deborah Keeler |
| Peter Kuentzel | Magdalena Lamarre |
| Patricia Lassiter | Jocelyne Legrand |
| Josefina Llarena | Sean Madison |
| Connie Miller | Lourdes Oroza |
| Nelson Pena | Lourdes Perez |
| Clyde Pfleegor | Melinda Prague |
| Madeline Pumariega | Penny Roache |
| Leslie Roberts | Nidia Romer |
| Herbert Robinson | Emily Sendin |
| Lucy Spence | James Sullivan |

MEMBERS ABSENT:

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Joshua Arjona | |
| Jennifer Jean Baptiste | |
| Oscar DeArmas | (Sent Notification) |
| Gail Hawks | |
| Maria Jofre | |
| Kaiyang Liang | (Sent Notification) |
| Neil Olsen | |
| Nelson Santiago | (Sent Notification) |

PRESENTER:

Joanne Bashford
Patrick Bibby
Jose Blanco
Gina Cortes-Suarez
Jeffrey Lukenbill

RESOURCE:

Julian Chiu
Norvell Holyfield
Joan Gosnell
Cathy Morris

RECORDER: Carol McAlister

1. **Call to Order**

Ian Cobham called the meeting to order.

2. **Introductions**

Ian Cobham introduced the following new members of College-wide CASSC:

- (1) Juan Abascal, representing the position of the Associate Provost for Academics,
- (2) Toni Bilbao, representing the position of the Associate Provost for Student Services, and
- (3) Melinda Prague, who will serve as the college-wide faculty representative for the Baccalaureate Degree Program in Education.

3. **Approval of the College-wide CASSC Minutes of December 9, 2003**

The College-wide CASSC minutes of December 9, 2003 were approved with the following correction: Page 2: Item 3 – (library media, network access)

Change to: *(library, media, network access)*

4. **Dr. Lukenbill's Updates**

Enrollment

Enrollment for 2003-2 term is up approximately 4% to 5% which is a substantial increase.

Recommended Budget for 2004-2005

For the 2004-2005 year, Governor Bush submitted a budget to the Legislature that is favorable for community colleges. The legislative process has already begun, and the regular session will commence officially in March. The proposed budget would help support enrollment growth. In addition, there are other provisions that would assist community colleges such as matching funds for scholarships and facilities. The down side is that the State hopes to raise money by having tuition increases.

The Legislature is faced with the challenge of meeting the Governor's expectations and adopting the funding levels proposed. Our support will be needed in a few weeks in terms of communicating with our legislators from outside the workplace via letters, e-mails, etc., to express support of the proposed funding increases for community colleges.

Miami International Film Festival (MIFF) (January 30 – February 8, 2004)

For faculty who feel it is appropriate to encourage their students to attend the Miami International Film Festival, or it fits into their curriculum, MIFF will have tickets available to as many students as possible. MIFF will also provide event access to a limited number of faculty and staff. It is requested that faculty inform the students that if the student requests a ticket(s), and is given a ticket(s), the student is expected to show up for the film(s).

Office of Institutional Effectiveness

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for the forthcoming Community College Survey of Student Engagement. This office will also be issuing a report on the completed Graduating Student Survey.

(a.) The Community College Survey of Student Engagement

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement will be coming forward in the not to distant future. The purpose of this survey is to acquire an overall view of colleges state-wide in terms of how involved students are in the learning process. The College is asking for faculty cooperation in completion of the survey, as it is difficult to have students take time away from class. Classes are selected at random.

(b.) Graduating Student Survey

Joanne Bashford will be issuing a report on the completed Graduating Student Survey in the near future. This survey was completed by students as they applied for graduation and covered a range of areas. The College is using the survey to distinguish the things well done, where students feel positive about the College, and in the areas in need of some improvement. With reference to the Graduating Student Survey, students strongly agreed they had gained an appreciation for lifelong learning. Also, according to the survey, students learned to work together in groups, and learned to cooperate to address educational and instructional goals. Graduating students can attest to the fact that faculty has done an admirable job. We should all be proud of the faculty and MDC.

5. **ENC 2106 Advanced Composition and Communication – Jose Blanco**

Jose Blanco presented a proposal that ENC 2106, Advanced Composition and Communication, be accepted as a CLAST alternative.

Rationale: In the past ENC 2301, Advanced Composition 1, was a 6,000 word Gordon Rule course that could be used to satisfy the CLAST requirement. However, the College no longer offers ENC 2301.

Concerning English, the State Board states “...the student must have earned a 2.5 grade point average in two courses for a minimum of six semester hours of credit from ENC 1101, English Composition 1, and ENC 1102, English Composition 2, or other equivalent college-level English courses.”

We submit that ENC 2106, Advanced Composition and Communication, is an equivalent college-level English course.

Effective Term: 2003-3

Catalog Description: This writing-based course addresses techniques of critical thinking, persuasion and argumentation. Students will refine their composition skills and develop their oral communication skills by examining and discussing a range of issues. This course fulfills the oral communication requirement and 4,000 words of the Gordon Rule Requirement. 3 credits

Prerequisite: ENC 1101, ENC 1102 or equivalent with a grade of “C: or better.

Course Competencies:

Competency 1: The student will employ critical thinking skills in reading, writing and oral communication by

- a. demonstrating logical reasoning.
- b. distinguishing fact from opinion.
- c. distinguishing between abstract and concrete ideas.
- d. synthesizing related ideas derived from different sources.
- e. recognizing and constructing inductive and deductive arguments.
- f. recognizing valid arguments and drawing logical inferences and conclusions.

Competency 2: The student will compose analytical and persuasive essays in response to assigned readings by

- a. identifying opposing arguments.
- b. acknowledging and addressing the complexity of an issue
- c. using reasoning and evidence to construct coherent arguments.
- d. citing specific sources to support written or oral discussions.
- e. applying the results of research to support conclusions.
- f. observing the conventions of standard edited American English.

Competency 3: The student will demonstrate proficiency in oral and written communication by

- a. generating, developing, organizing, and presenting ideas effectively.
- b. shaping communication to purpose, audience, and occasion.
- c. analyzing similarities and differences between oral and written communication.
- d. analyzing the impact of variables such as gender, orientation, and ethnicity.
- e. practicing critical listening.

**UNANIMOUS
APPROVAL
0 OPPOSED
0 ABSTAINED**

6. **MDC Accreditation Process Update – Gina Cortes-Suarez**

Gina Cortes-Suarez reported that the MDC accreditation process has two parts. One part of the process is the Compliance Document which is due at SACS by March 15, 2004. The second part of the accreditation process is the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The Quality Enhancement Plan is a new SACS requirement. Last summer a meeting was held to discuss the documents that were to be submitted to SACS. We were aware that the College had to submit a plan of action. The plan had to be based on empirical evidence at the institution that pointed to a problem or an issue that the institution wanted to address. After review of institutional research information, what the discipline committees had been working with, what concept and issues had come up, what questions we had about curriculum, our students, and so forth, the issue that kept surfacing was mathematics as an obstacle to graduation and success. The Quality Enhancement Plan is based on student success in the area of mathematics. The document has been titled, “Student Success and Retention: The Mathematics Connection”. Also, the hard work of the Mathematics Discipline Committee was acknowledged.

7. **Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) -Patrick Bibby**

Gina Cortes-Suarez introduced Patrick Bibby, Chair of the Quality Enhancement Team, who recognized the historic and dedicated team work and presented a QEP update. The QEP describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses enhancing student learning. The issue is not retention; the issue is student learning. Retention would be a by-product of student learning. While many aspects of the accreditation process focus on the past and the present, the QEP is forward looking and thus transforms the process into an ongoing activity rather than an episodic event.

By requirement, the development of the QEP must have broad participation. The Quality Enhancement Team has 38 members including mathematics faculty, faculty from other disciplines, administrators, student services personnel, students, and a member of the Board of Trustees. The focus is enhancing student learning in mathematics. The first group to meet were the members of the mathematics faculty that are on the QEP as they are working directly with the students with about 50% success rate. The high risk math courses that will be focused on are MAT 0020, 0024, 1033 and MAC 1105 the Beginning, Intermediate and College Algebra courses, as the pass rates in those courses range traditionally from 48% to 52%. Student assessment in mathematics is based on tests. Typically students get one test per month and this can become a traumatic event for some students. The group came up with the idea of testing more frequently to make the intervention process more effective. The following meeting was of the full QEP team and they seemed responsive to the idea of frequent testing, and other elements of the QEP were put together. One of the elements was math in other disciplines with the idea of weaving math into other courses. Other ideas were to develop a mathematics based SLS course, along with enhancing student support and advisement.

Following are the QEP Committees and the proposed tasks. The “list of tasks” will remain flexible throughout the process as the committees may discover that some additional tasks need to be completed as they proceed. Each committee has at least one mathematics person.

QEP Proposed Committee Charges

Best Practices Committee

- Conduct research (internet, ERIC, journal articles, etc.) to discover best practices in mathematics education at the beginning college level.
- Arrange for possible visitations to best-practice institutions. Explore possible funding for visitations through Learning Innovations.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit it to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

Literature Research Committee

- Conduct research in the following areas: Effects of frequent testing, mathematics achievement, feedback, and testing practices.
- Write a 10 – 15 page literature review with citations using the APA format.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit it to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks by April 30, 2004

Software Evaluation Committee

- Develop rubrics to evaluate all software.
- Evaluate commercially produced mathematics testing software. Software may be produced by Publishers as textbook ancillaries or by independent companies.
- Evaluate commercially produced mathematics tutoring software. Software may be produced by publishers as textbook ancillaries or by independent companies.
- From each company whose software receives a positive evaluation, obtain a set of instructions on how the software may be used by instructors.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

System Requirements Committee

- Determine hardware requirements, including wiring, networking, and electrical.
- Resolve the issue of test security.
- Explore backup systems in case a server goes down or the system fails in any way.
- Conduct a review of privacy screens for use in the testing lab.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit it to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

Facilities Committee

- Determine location for a mathematics computer testing lab at each campus.
- Determine location for a mathematics tutoring lab at each campus.
- Determine classroom needs for best mathematics instruction.
- Explore the feasibility of constructing dedicated mathematics buildings at North and Kendall Campuses.
- Arrange for visitations to other institutions with exemplary mathematics facilities.
- Be sure all recommendations with regard to facilities comply with national standards.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

Student Support and Advisement Committee

- Determine tutor training needs.
- Determine advisement strategies to assure that students enroll sequentially in their mathematics courses, i.e., that they take no major term breaks from mathematics.
- Determine appropriate strategies for advising and orienting new students
- Determine strategies that would consider the affective domain.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

Mathematics-Based SLS Course Committee

- Write the competencies for this course and present it to the campus and college-wide CASSC committees for approval.
- Determine which students should enroll in this course.
- Design a training program for faculty or advisors who would teach this course.
- Explore the possibility of offering more mathematics courses through learning communities.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit it to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

Mathematics in Other Disciplines Committee

- Determine the appropriate subjects in which to incorporate mathematics and mathematical concepts.
- Design strategies to imbed mathematics in other disciplines.
- Be creative.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit it to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

Mathematics Committee

- Write suggested syllabi to incorporate frequent testing.
- Determine grading system. For example, in each unit, we might have 6 quizzes (counting the top 5) and a major test. For the entire course, we might have 20 quiz grades, 4 unit test grades, and a final exam grade to determine a student's course grade.
- Review textbooks associated with the software that the Software Committee evaluates highly.
- Imagine that Mathematics has a separate facility on each campus, maybe a dedicated building on the larger campuses and a dedicated space on the smaller campuses. What would be in this facility? For example, state-of-the-art classrooms, faculty offices, tutoring labs, a testing lab, an advisement area, a mathematics library, a computer courtyard where students could access the Internet, and a special area for the Baccalaureate program.
- Recommend appropriate use of technology in the mathematics classroom. For example, in which course and to what extent should graphing calculators play a major role in the instructional process?
- Serve as content-area resource persons to the other committees on which you serve.
- Write a summary of each committee meeting and submit to Pat Bibby.
- Complete all tasks and submit recommendations by April 30, 2004.

Steering Committee

- Search for possible grants to help fund the implementation of QEP.
- Keep the plan coordinated across all committees.

The QEP itself is a narrative, no more than 75 pages, double spaced, with 25 pages of documentation for a total of approximately 100 pages. The committees will have completed their tasks by the end of April. Each committee has at least one resource person, not a committee member, having expertise in a specific area of the committee. The plan will be submitted to SACS and implemented at the College. Although the plan has no guarantee, we have a great deal of confidence in the project.

Deborah Keeler had a question concerning performing a literature review at the same time they are performing other types of evaluations. Normally a literature review provides the impetus or the theory on which to build further research. Pat Bibby stated that the committee's work is not like writing a dissertation, and concurred with Ms. Keeler that the Best Practices and Literature Review groups' work would have some overlap.

Susan Kah addressed the need for Medical Center Campus to help their students be successful in those classes that are not math classes, but have a substantial math content such as computation of drug dosages. After discussion, Pat Bibby suggested that the Mathematics in Other Disciplines' Committee second task, which is "Design strategies to imbed mathematics in other disciplines," include the task "to support mathematics components in other disciplines."

8. **Standards of Academic Progress – Armando Ferrer**

Armando Ferrer presented an update on the Standards of Academic Progress (SOAP). The College has to change its current SOAP procedures for earned credits to comply with Federal Financial Aid guidelines. We currently utilize a 50% enrolled to completion rate for our students. The institution will change this to a 67% enrolled to completion rate. During the spring term, we will inform students who would have fallen under the new guidelines of the mandated changes. These guidelines will not be implemented in spring term. Students will be notified that they must improve their performance or they will be affected at the end of the summer term. At the end of the summer, the College will implement the new earned credit requirement. This will put us in compliance and give us the month of August to help students with the new guidelines.

9. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee Update- Joanne Bashford**

Joanne Bashford with the assistance of Lourdes Perez presented an Institutional Effectiveness Committee update.

SACS REQUIREMENT

- Systematic review of programs and services
 - What we do?
 - How well do we do it?
 - How are using results to improve?

UNIT LEVEL EFFECTIVENESS

- Institutional Effectiveness Inventory by CASSC Institutional Effectiveness Committee (2002)
- Results:
 - Some units did not have purpose, statements, goals or expected outcomes, and/or measures.
 - We all had some work to do to document our effectiveness process!
- CASSC Institutional Effectiveness Committee prepared annual report templates for disciplines/schools and service areas.
 - Purpose
 - Goals
 - Accomplishments
 - Analysis and use of results
 - Support/resources
 - Goals for the coming year
- Reports submitted by discipline convener, school director, service area director
- Approved by coordinating campus president
- Initial submission in October, 2003
- Summer submission in 2004
- Feedback
- Challenges
- **Results: Close to 100% of units now have purpose, goals and measures.**

CAMPUS/AREA LEVEL EFFECTIVENESS

- Annual goals/priorities
3 primary, measurable goals/priorities
- Planning meetings/retreats
- Annual planning document for College
- Challenges

COLLEGE LEVEL EFFECTIVENESS

- How well do we achieve mission and vision?
- College Effectiveness Plan
Key questions based on mission/vision
Core Measures
Presentation of results
Use of results
- Key Questions
How accessible are MDC programs and services?
How affordable are MDC programs and services?
How well does MDC help students progress through the curriculum to acquire needed knowledge and skills?
How successful are MDC students in their academic and career pursuits after leaving MDC?
How satisfied are MDC students with the education and services provided by the College?
How well does MDC encourage creativity, risk-taking and accountability in employees?
How well does MDC work in partnership with the community?
How effectively does MDC use its resources?
- Measures
Core Measures from Accountability, student surveys, employ Institutional Effectiveness survey and Institutional Research data
Two or three Core Measures for each Key Question
Other information referenced that can be used at Campus/Area or unit level
- Process
Annual reporting
Annual college-wide planning meetings to review performance
Annual campus/divisional planning meetings and retreats
Informs budget decisions and Strategic Planning

MISSION AND VISION

- Strategic Planning Long Range Goals (5 years)
Goals focus on aspects of the MDC mission/vision
Annual evaluation
Annual report to Board of Trustees
- Effectiveness
College Effectiveness
MDC Effectiveness Plan/Core Measures
Annual Report to CASSC & Executive Leadership
Campus/Area Effectiveness
Annual Goals/Priorities
Annual Meetings/Planning Sessions
Unit Effectiveness (Academic, Student Support, and Administrative Areas)
Area goals and Annual Reports
Annual Report to Deans/Vice Provosts

Annual budget priorities
Annual leadership meetings & goals

NEXT STEPS

- CASSC Institutional Effectiveness Committee recommendations to CASSC and Executive Committee
- Refine Institutional Effectiveness documents: Plan, Overview, and Summary
- Publish on web
- Spread the word
- Institutional Effectiveness Compliance documents due to SACS in March, 2004

Joanne Bashford will e-mail to the College-wide CASSC members the Institutional Effectiveness Plan for the College, the Planning and Effectiveness Process Overview, and Planning and Effectiveness Summary. These documents are for review and feedback by January 30, 2004.

10. **Announcements**
The next College-wide CASSC Meeting will be on February 10, 2004 at 1:30 p.m., Room 2106, Wolfson Campus.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

CASSC INFORMATION & CURRICULUM FORMS

This information is on the web.

GO to the MDC Home Page.

1. Click directly on “EMPLOYEES” link
2. ‘EMPLOYEES’ window will open.
Look at the left column and click on ‘DEPARTMENTS & ORGANIZATIONS’
3. Choose and click directly on the “CASSC” link.
All CASSC information including the Curriculum Forms and CASSC Feedback Form can be found here.

COLLEGE-WIDE CASSC SCHEDULE

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| February 10, 2004 (General Education Proposal) | 1:30 P.M. Room 2106 | Wolfson |
| March 9, 2004 (General Education Vote) | 1:30 P.M. Room 2106 | Wolfson |
| April 13, 2004 | 1:30 P.M. Room 2106 | Wolfson |
| <i>May 18, 2004</i> | 1:30 P.M. <i>Room 3208-09</i> | <i>Wolfson</i> |
| June 8, 2004 | 1:30 P.M. Room 2106 | Wolfson |

July – NO MEETING

August – NO MEETING