November 1, 2011 Adjunct Only Meeting

**Morning session**

Case #1. Concern about the caps. Raising caps is highly unfair. It sabotages the ISP program. 300 level ISP went from 24 to 38 for some. For others it went from 60 to 100 in lecture course. Labs are difficult to do with 38 students. Other classes require a research paper, with a proposal (rough draft) and then the final. This is in reference to IN courses.

Case #2. How can assessment be done with foreign languages? How can writing in foreign languages be assessed? (The solution would be to have the department do it.) How can diversity or perspective outcomes be differentiated from a 100 to a 200 level course?

Case #3. Concern over advising, especially for incoming freshmen. It seems that IQL and ITW should be their first choices.

Case #4. Concern for incoming freshmen. They are unaware of the ISP program. It is not covered in orientation.

Case #5. There seems to be many questions about the program. More conversations about the language, clarification of terms, a consensus on the meaning of terms, of the program are needed. Need to clarify what we are supposed to accomplish, especially with outcomes and specific assignments.

Case #6. If they are going to hold adjuncts to certain standards, are they going to hold tenure stream to the same standards? Will they enforce the same rules on tenure stream faculty? Do we all meet the outcomes? Can we measure the outcomes at the end of the semester since it takes a while for the material to sink in?

Case #7. The ISP concept is good, the idea of educational objectives is positive. The accountability for students and faculty is also good. The concept of the artifacts is confusing. There should be more guidance for assigning the project leading to the artifact. Would like greater assistance with project selection. There should be more structure for artifacts.

Case #8. Pre-semester meetings are needed. Coordinators need to hold more meetings in order to more effectively discuss common curriculum outcomes for similar courses. These meetings need to lead to meaningful curriculum changes and should create easily understandable artifacts. Tenure track should be obligated under their cba to follow the guidelines of the ISP manual, specifically as it relates to coordinating common ISP course. Otherwise senior adjunct faculty should be given serious consideration for course coordinators. Raising class caps contradicts the advertised advantages of a public liberal arts college that has small classes and accessible faculty. We will lose students if class caps keep increasing.

**Afternoon faculty 3-5pm**

Case #1 - Really good things: It is intended to go beyond a simple menu and to ensure there was a developmental sequence, so there would be core courses, a foundation for competence. The idea is that there will be upper division ISP courses.

The effort to have a suite of themes is valuable because it provides coherence.

Problems: responding to surveys. There are pieces in the ISP that are problematic. Some outcomes are not clear and should not have to be included on the syllabus. Language is unclear. When the ISP was designed it was never intended that faculty would have to include exact magic language. It has become overly legalistic and bureaucratic.

What would you do differently? Go back to the original gen ed.

Lack of faculty buy-in, why?
What is the meaning of faculty buy-in or lack of faculty buy-in?
Perception - “That’s for the adjuncts to do.” Why did that happen?
Do away with telling faculty how to teach.
Very few students upload files for ISP. This is the only program that requires students to upload files.
The direction for the drop-box are not clear. It is not clear how to simulate the student experience.
How does assessment work? What about content of the essays? “I had essays that were deemed
competent but the content is not understood.”
The ISP is fundamentally flawed.
People who are competent should assess, Content knowledge is not built into the ISP.
The unrepresentational of the artifacts. Form over content.
Deeply flawed. Fatal flaws in the program.
Another problem – courses taken away from KSC, that means ISP courses need to be accepted by other
institutions.

Case #2 – students have trouble with Bb.

Case #3 – Upper level 300 courses, every student must take 2 of these courses. There is a waiver for
students who have studied abroad. At the 300 level, it will be beyond the introductory level.
Transferable credits from institutions overseas.
Is there direct communication between GEO and ISP? Yes. There have been meetings. *** emphasized
we want the data.
The assessment process does not work. Faculty don’t assess in the way according to the outcomes.
Rubrics are not needed. Rubrics don’t inform. I resent the notion that faculty have to start assessing
students. The exercise is nonetheless worthwhile.
IQL is not working. The best evidence is that departments are saying don’t take IQL but take statistics.
IQL was designed so that everything needed to be parallel, a companion to ITW. IQL was designed
without a faculty base to teach the course. There was no infrastructure. Math 141 is an alternative to
IQL.
Do you think IQL is fixable? The best fix would be to embed the quantitative piece in other courses.
Also, there could be an exam to test students.
It is very difficult to teach IQL. IQL assumes there is a pool of folks who can teach the course. IQL needs
to teach the x and y coordinates.
IQL might well need specialists.

Case #4. Never taught an ISP Tension over the demanding, the requirements are demanding. It has to
have certain outcome. But it had to be inviting, but TT did not find it inviting. The demands outweighed
the inviting. It needs to be more inviting.
The recommendation: finding the right balance between demanding and inviting.
Tenure track faculty do not find it inviting. There is enough in the department for the TT track to do.
The administrative piece – the direction of the assessment and the form of the assessment. ************
It had been shared leadership. There is no faculty chair.
The perception is: It is basically what was before but disguised in a new way.
There should be a way to adjust as we go along. (The old gen ed was in place for 30yrs. There was no
administrative structure – Now there is an ISP a committee structure for policy, there is also an
assessment apparatus.)
How to make curriculum changes? 1. First the ISP committee would do it. 2) then the faculty senate

Case #5 – The college does offer a lot to faculty who teach it. The perceptive is that the ISP is the old
gen.
Was the training equal for new hires and adjuncts. Some training is paid for new hires. Not many
adjuncts at informal meetings.
Case #6 – never taught in ISP. No room in her schedule. Not qualified to teach IQL and ITW.

II course proposal shot down because it was not integrative. Not having the right credentials. The II approved *** and ***.