MEETING MINUTES
General Education Committee
September 4, 2015 (PBG) / September 11, 2015 (LW)
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
PTLC, Palm Beach Gardens / NS 138, Lake Worth

ITEM 1. Welcome and introductions (9:30 – 9:50)
Discussion: All members of the 2015-16 General Education committee who were in attendance introduced themselves including new members, Luke Rogers, Mindy Yale (previous member) and new Executive Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, Donald Taylor. Committee members from the Palm Beach Gardens campus could not be present because of a time conflict with convocation exercises on that campus, so they met separately to discuss the agenda items on 9/4 with Patrick Tierney, Karen Pain, and Don Taylor, and their comments were integrated into the discussion at the 9/11 meeting.

Data/source: Notes from the 9/4 meeting with north campus committee members.
Action: n/a

ITEM 2. Approve Minutes from the 4/24/15 meeting (9:50 – 9:55)
Discussion: Minutes from the 4/24/15 meeting had been previously disseminated via email; minutes from that meeting were approved without comment.

Data/source: Minutes from 4/24/15
Action: Karen will have minutes uploaded to website.

ITEM 3. Committee purpose and (re)structure (9:55 – 10:05)
Discussion: Karen Pain and Pat Tierney distributed a starting point to define a purpose for the committee: To provide a vehicle for faculty-driven continuous improvement that ensures sound teaching practices and simultaneously meets accreditation requirements. There was much discussion by members of the committee who sought to have the purpose be more specific and to make it more like a mission statement by which all committee actions should be measured.

John Gaul asked how the committee would measure/assess “continuous improvement”. Donald Taylor confirmed the committee’s purpose should not be based on achieving accreditation requirements. The committee agreed that individuals and groups focusing on learning outcomes...
would result in accreditation requirements being met. Tracy Ciucci mentioned that if clusters chose to re-evaluate their learning outcomes, they should consider the College mission, the General Education outcomes, and state and national standards. The outcome of the discussion was a mission statement for the Assessment Committee which reads as follows: The mission of the assessment committee is to facilitate continuous improvement of student learning by supporting faculty in individual and collaborative review of learning outcome performance.

Karen also introduced the idea of creating sub-committees/teams within the committee to ensure that each member has an opportunity to contribute to the committee’s mission. First, there will be the formal creation of the “General Education Council” (comprised of up to 9 faculty liaisons and a chair) who will help facilitate assessment for the General Education areas specifically. Current members are Tracy Ciucci, John Gaul, Marcie Pachter, Holly Larson, and Pat Tierney (chair). The second team would be an “Assessment Resource Team” consisting of assessment experts who would not be content experts. This team would find assessment resources, evaluate them, and make them available to faculty. The Council and the Resource team would meet separately as needed and report to the larger committee two or three times per year. Release time for Council participation may be available and will be determined on an annual basis.

Data/source: Action: Karen will work on getting this year’s committee members and the new mission statement posted online.

**ITEM 4. Picking up where we left off**

Discussion: Development Day: Karen mentioned that the committee members would not have any direct responsibilities for fall Development Day. The items to be focused on will be textbook selection, affordability, and options, and Dave Wells will focus on the QEP initiative for Professional Learning Groups. Tracy talked about the challenge to get textbook prices down with the publisher only to have the prices driven back up by the bookstore. Students are now being advised that they have the option of buying books directly from the publishers for less whenever possible.

Pat Tierney mentioned that he invited President Parker to attend the meeting but she was unavailable. He will continue to invite her until she is able to come.

Scenarios: Pat mentioned that the Communications scenario and the Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning scenario will be reintroduced this semester but should be checked first. There is no longer a learning outcome for Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning, but Karen proposed that this scenario could be used for math alone. Pat and Mindy will work on the Quantitative Reasoning Scenario over the next week. Luke and Marcie will work on a scenario for Communications. There is still a need for scenarios or other measures for Natural Sciences, Humanities, and Social Science. Karen will reach out to Vernon Grant to invite Humanities faculty members to assist or make suggestions to the committee for assessment options in Humanities.

The results from the last three years of scenarios assessment indicate that Critical Thinking has gone up whereas Ethics, Global Awareness, and Information Literacy have gone down. Don mentioned that the assessment process has improved, but that as an institution, we also need to be concerned about improvement and what plans are in place to “move the needle” using this information.

Tracy referenced the need to evaluate online and hybrid vs face-to-face classes as the results are different. In the summer, “Dean Observers” helped observe online classes and noticed a wide discrepancy. Karen added that currently, assessment is not done exclusively in distance learning sections but that distant learning students are included in the reporting (they are separated from the results within the annual report to compare to classroom students).
Embedded assessment – will be repeated again this year, in all sections of all Gen Ed courses. Feedback from numerous faculty last spring will inform how we communicate to faculty and adjuncts this year. **Next steps:** Karen is working on a video to send as a streaming link, explaining briefly why we do this and how to report results this year. She added that we need to evaluate our process and consider other ideas. As an example, she explained that students at St. Petersburg College are sent an email once they reach about 45 credits, and the emails asks the students to participated in institutional assessment. The email explains the process and provides a link to an online “course” that is actually the assessment. Such a process captures all students including those who only attend online.

Gordon Rule statement – a survey was sent to all faculty last spring, as the statement was finalized to be sent to the Academic Dean’s Council. Using feedback, the committee made some final adjustments to the statement at the last meeting. **Next steps:** Karen will get it on the agenda for Dean’s Council this semester. Pending their approval, campus sessions will be set up as informal brown bag sessions with faculty and facilitated by committee liaisons to discuss some of the questions/concerns posed by survey respondents. Pat Tierney will also be presenting to the PTLC depending on the result of the Dean’s Council.

Karen mentioned the Pearson Writing tool which was demonstrated by representatives during the last Gen. Ed. meeting. Holly Larson gave a report on the comparison of Pearson and Grammarly. She found Grammarly to be less tedious and confusing for students than Pearson. The feedback for students was more holistic from Grammarly. The evaluation of these and other tools is another task for the Resource Assessment Team. Sheila Scott-Lubin asked why the College was not using Smarthinking across the board. Debra Singleton mentioned that cost was the issue when Smarthinking was first proposed. Karen will contact Syd in e-learning to see if there are college–wide options are available. Tracy will check with her McGraw Hill representative to see if there is a comparable product available. Sheila will check with Cengage for the same and all will report findings at the October 2 Gen. Ed. meeting.

The fall dates for full committee meetings were published. They are October 2, October 30, and November 20.

**Data/source:** Gordon Rule Survey results; previous meeting minutes and Gordon Rule Statement versions, draft annual report for General Assessment.

**Action:** Sheila Scott-Lubin will contact Cengage, Tracy Ciucci will check with McGraw-Hill, Karen Pain will check with Sid regarding Smarthinking, and in all cases, the purpose will be to determine if other products are available that the committee should review as potential large-scale resources.

**ITEM 5.** **Next meetings**

**Discussion:** Pat Tierney announced that the next meeting dates are October 2, October 30, and November 20. These are all full committee meetings.

**Data/source:** n/a

**Action:** Pat Tierney will send out meeting invitations to the committee for these dates.

Meeting to be adjourned at 11:30am

Submitted by

Debra-Anne Singleton
Meeting Scribe