

**MINUTES  
General Education Assessment Committee  
Thursday, June 3, 2010  
2:30 pm - 5:00 pm  
Conference Room B, Lake Worth**

---

<b>Attendance:</b>	Louise Aurelien <input type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Childers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Millas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Andrew Plotkin <input type="checkbox"/>
Carole Policy <input type="checkbox"/>	Syeda Qadri <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Terry Randolph <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Matilde Roig-Watnik <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Helen Shub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Victor Slesinger <input type="checkbox"/>
Melissa Stonecipher <input type="checkbox"/>	Patrick Tierney <input type="checkbox"/>	Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bobette Wolesensky <input type="checkbox"/>		

**ITEM 1. Grading of the Revised Scenarios: Communications, Global Awareness, Quantitative Reasoning**

Discussion: The committee divided into two groups – one to grade the quantitative reasoning scenarios and the other to grade the global awareness scenarios. Professor Karen Pain and Dr. Syeda Qadri reviewed the quantitative reasoning scenarios and found that 96% of the students in this re-pilot scored a 3 or lower out of a possible score of 5. When these scores were brought to the rest of the committee for discussion, a number of issues were raised. In order to determine if the problem still lies with the instrument, the committee made a number of suggestions for further study, including:

- An item analysis should be performed to see if there were some questions that the students missed more than others;
- The IRE Office can pull students entry level test scores to see what kind of math scores they came in with; and,
- See if these students have taken math here and if that made any difference in how they scored.

Once the above review takes place, a small sub-committee will meet to determine if further modifications should be made to the scenario. If revisions are made, and if time permits, it is possible that there will be one more pilot of this scenario before the fall semester begins.

The Global Awareness scenario was graded by the remaining members of the committee, specifically, Professor Joe Millas, Professor Matilde Roig-Watnik, Professor David Childers, Professor Connie Tuisku, Dr. Jennifer Campbell, Dr. Ginger Pedersen, Dr. Syeda Qadri, Professor Terry Randolph and Helen Shub. The committee had a lengthy discussion

focused around whether the way one of the questions was stated in the scenario matched what was in the grading rubric. It was ultimately determined by the committee that the first question could not be graded effectively if a student wrote an essay in which he or she expressed skepticism about global warming, no matter how persuasive the argument was. The second question, however, which dealt with civic involvement, posed no such concern and the committee was able to grade those responses. It is believed by the committee that if the students had been able to focus on only that question, the answers would have been more thorough.

The committee determined that the best course of action for the Global Awareness scenario is to ask the students to answer only one question. In addition, it was suggested by the committee that the single question not be too complex so that students will have time to focus their thoughts and provide a thorough answer. Professor Randolph will confer with Professor Bobette Wolessensky to determine if they want that question to focus on the environment or civic responsibility. If they choose to focus on the environment, the question and/or the rubric will be rewritten so that no matter which position a student takes on the global warming issue, as long as they provide a cogent argument, the student will be able to receive full credit for his or her answer.

Professor Tierney, who was unable to attend the meeting, volunteered to review the Communications scenarios prior to the meeting and to confer with the other English faculty on the committee regarding his findings. Helen Shub reported to the committee that Professor Tierney's conclusion is that the revisions made to the Communications scenario made a substantial difference in terms of the quality of the responses. By clarifying that the response was to be in the form of a formal essay, it appears that the students understood the assignment and were able to provide their answers in a way that made the grading more meaningful and representative of the students' ability to write a formal essay.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Additional review of the Quantitative Reasoning scenario will be conducted to determine if further revisions need to be made. A third pilot may be administered of this scenario during the summer.

Professor Randolph will meet with Professor Wolessensky to determine what question will be asked in the Global Awareness scenario. If the focus is on the environment, the scenario question and/or rubric will be revised to allow students who present either side of the global warming issue to be graded in an equivalent manner.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe