

**MEETING AGENDA/MINUTES**  
**General Education Committee**  
**October 30, 2015**  
**9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.**  
**NS 138, Lake Worth**

---

<b>Attendance:</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ted Cascio	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emma Chow	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tracy Ciucci
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tcherina Duncombe	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Gaul	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Holly Larson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marcie Pachter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Pain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ginger Pedersen
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Pena	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anthony Piccolino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ana Porro
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Rogers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sheila Scott-Lubin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Debra-Anne Singleton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Warren Smith	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patrick Tierney, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Donald Taylor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Wells	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mindy Yale	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Helena Zacharis

- ITEM 1.**                      **Welcome and introductions**  
Discussion:                  Ted Cascio was introduced to the committee.
- ITEM 2.**                      **PLG at Lake Worth**  
Discussion:                  David Wells confirmed that Elizabeth Wilber has openings for a PLG on this campus. Anyone working on a rubric, a presentation, or anything new for the classroom, should contact Elizabeth as a PLG is a great place to share and air ideas.
- ITEM 3.**                      **Approve Minutes from the 10/02/15 meeting**  
Discussion:                  Minutes from the 10/2/15 meeting had been previously disseminated via email; minutes from that meeting were approved without comment.  
Data/source:                Minutes from 10/2/15  
Action:                        Karen will have minutes uploaded to website.
- ITEM 4.**                      **Re-review the Scenarios**  
Discussion:                  The committee chair opened discussion regarding the need for a way to score students who refuse to participate in the process or choose the response to the prompt as platform to express discontent. The committee agreed that a distinction is necessary between these student and those who scored the lowest possible score based on an actual attempt to respond to the scenario.  
Action:                        An extra column will be added to rubrics (NR) to indicate a "non-response" in these cases, and the score will be zero. Zero scores will not be averaged with other scores.  
Discussion:                  Math and Communications scenario reviews have already been completed.  
Pat Tierney asked that all revisions resulting from this meeting's reviews be sent to him saved as "November Revisions".  
When creating rubrics the question should be asked, "Where does proficiency and/or lie? Scorers need to be made aware of what "passing" is.
- Global Awareness:** (presented by Marcie Pachter) The Learning Outcome was considered when reviewing the elements of the scenario. After much discussion, the scenario and rubric were completely redone to

incorporate. Creating two separate categories was considered, but it would have presented difficulty with scoring.

**Science:** (presented by Tcherina Duncombe and Emma Chow) A chemistry hypothesis was designed after the last Gen. Ed. Meeting. The student's thought process is what is being measured. The Learning Outcome for science measures the student's ability to use the scientific method. A more generic scenario is needed. A scenario that incorporates all of the sciences will be developed. A crime scene analysis was an example of the type of scenario that would work for all the sciences thus simplifying the rubric.

**Critical Thinking:** (presented by David Wells) The rubric has been reviewed and the team is satisfied with it. The scenario will remain as is but the questions may be modified to prevent students from assigning fault while still using critical thinking to come up with courses of action. Dave will work with QEP Support Team members to finalize the revision.

**Information Literacy:** (presented by Connie Tuisku) There was some discussion that the objectives for Information Literacy do not need a traditional rubric as the objective is whether or not the student got it right. Point totals in a range would be more appropriate. Were they able to name key word synonyms and evaluate information and making it relevant? A research question will be developed and will also be useful to the evaluators as without a question the material is too broad. The goal is for students to demonstrate a general understanding of the types of information available in the library database. Students will also be asked what information they would need to properly site a source.

**Ethics:** (presented by Luke Rogers) The committee questioned the need for the two scenarios that have been created for Ethics. Two things need to be evaluated. The first is the ability to determine right from wrong in a scenario where the choice is clear. The second is the need for a more complex ethical perspective in what is perceived as a no win scenario. In the interest of time, the committee suggested combining the two scenarios by adding a question to the second scenario that would address both objectives. The rubric would also be adjusted to provide the opportunity to evaluate both. The response not the structure of the essay is being evaluated.

**Social Science:** (presented by Mindy Yale) Creating something that would assess all the social science was difficult. The scenario presenting the impact of a tsunami was created. The team has been working on refining the rubric. This will allow them to better modify the scenario. The scenario doesn't need to provide to opportunity to evaluate every area. The committee thought the rubric was too large may benefit from clearer descriptions in its categories. Students need to demonstrate an ability to apply the information gathered. The team will design the scenario and work back to the rubric.

**Humanities:** The Humanities faculty is working on their own scenario. The questions will be applicable to whatever art form is being assessed.

Action: Next meeting is scheduled for November 20<sup>th</sup>. The chair will send out a preliminary list of items to be covered in advance.

**ITEM 5.** Time for Scenario Teams to re-re-Review Scenarios

Discussion:

Action: Go and work!!!

Meeting adjourned at 11:30am

Submitted by

Debra-Anne Singleton, Scribe