

Meeting Minutes
General Education Committee
Friday, January 31, 2014
10:00a.m. – 12:00 noon
CPB 201, Lake Worth

Attendance:	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emma Chow <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Barbara Edgar <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robin Fiedler <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Knopp <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Pena <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ana Porro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Helen Shub, Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Debra-Anne Singleton <input type="checkbox"/>	Warren Smith <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Melissa Stonecipher <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Tierney <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

ITEM 1. Assessment Results Review

Discussion: Helen Shub informed the committee that the recommendations for the revisions to the general education program were formally approved by the Academic Deans' Council.

Ms. Shub distributed the assessment results for general education and the Associate of Arts Degree. The committee reviewed all the results and arrived at the following conclusions/decisions:

1. Many of the assessment instruments require improvement. Clusters will be asked to respond to the assessment worksheet in writing in order to address any possible shortcomings in their assessment instruments.
2. The collection process needs revision. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) will simplify the collection process to reduce errors and work load for faculty.
3. Benchmarks for the scenarios will be increased from 2.5 to 3.0.
4. The institution-wide improvement strategies for this cycle will be as follows:
 - a. Writing across the Curriculum (General Education)
 - b. QEP – Critical Thinking workshops (General Education)
 - c. Transcript analysis to better place students into appropriate classes (A.A. Degree)
 - d. Further discussion will take place to determine if clusters will be required to develop improvement strategies this cycle.
5. Recommendations for further analysis of the data include:
 - a. Rerun the scenario scores to see what percentage of students scored 4 or 5

- b. For the Proficiency Profile results, compare PBSC's results to a comparison group consisting of similar schools, particularly diverse schools from states like Texas, California and Arizona.

Source: Assessment results for general education (Proficiency Profile and embedded assessments) and the Associate of Arts degree (Proficiency Profile and Scenarios); Guidelines for Faculty re: embedded assessments.

Action: Communications will be sent to faculty regarding the improvement of assessment instruments. IRE will work on simplifying the collection process of assessment results for the next assessment cycle. Ms. Shub will do further analysis of this cycle's assessment results and provide it to the committee at a future meeting.

ITEM 2. Gordon Rule

Discussion: Tabled until next meeting

Source: None

Action: None

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe