

PALM BEACH STATE COLLEGE

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

Attendance:	Irving Berkowitz ☒	Jennifer Campbell ☒
Emma Chow ☒	Tracy Ciucci ☒	Tcherina Duncombe ☒
John Gaul ☒	David Knopp ☒	Holly Larson ☒
Marcie Pachter ☒	Karen Pain ☒	Ginger Pedersen ☒
David Pena ☒	Anthony Piccolino ☒	Sheila Scott-Lubin ☒
Helen Shub ☒	Debra Ann-Singleton ☒	Warren Smith ☒
Melissa Stonecipher ☒	Patrick Tierney, Chair ☒	Connie Tuisku ☒

ITEM 1. Approval of Minutes

Discussion: Professor Pat Tierney opened the meeting by welcoming Holly Larson, English Professor on the Boca Raton campus, to the committee. Welcome, Professor Larson!

The minutes from the prior meeting were approved.

Source: None

Action: None.

ITEM 2. Debrief of Development Day Breakout Sessions/PTLC Campus Discussion on Gordon Rule

Discussion: Professor Tierney shared with the committee the feedback from the Development Day session on the Gordon Rule. Many of the faculty who submitted feedback forms expressed positive views about the draft rubric. There were numerous comments regarding the interpretation of the word “significant” related to the extent to which writing should account toward a student’s final grade.

Two Speech faculty were in attendance at one of the breakout sessions and reported their impressions to their cluster later in the day. This led to the Speech cluster preparing a statement to the General Education Committee which Professor Marcie Pachter read.

In essence, the statement described the Speech cluster's perception that the development of the Gordon Rule Statement was not inclusive enough of faculty opinion and that they were declining to participate in further discussion. This led to a lengthy committee discussion on ways to improve communication. A number of suggestions were made including, round table discussions, a facilitated discussion board and PTLC forums. As part of this discussion, several committee members brought up that they have heard from colleagues that they are confused about the general education assessment process. To help alleviate that confusion, it was suggested that a formal statement be developed from the committee to explain the plans for general education assessment for the next several years and the reasons behind those decisions. As part of this statement, it was suggested that faculty be given a clear timeline for the general education assessment plan – both short term and long term. It was further suggested that face-to-face discussions are more effective than sending out written statements. Ms. Shub will ask Dr. Ginger Pedersen if there will be an opportunity during the January cluster meetings to address the faculty in the super-clusters that contain general education courses.

Source: None

Action: A small group of committee members will meet to draft a statement for faculty. The statement will be brought to the next committee meeting for review. Connie Tuisku, Patrick Tierney, Helen Shub and Jennifer Campbell volunteered to help draft the statement.

Ms. Shub will contact Dr. Pedersen to get information about the January cluster meetings.

ITEM 3. Review Products for Gordon Rule Assistance

Discussion: The committee discussed the pros and cons of Research Companion and Pearson Writer. It was agreed that the products have different functions – Research Companion focuses on information literacy and Pearson Writer on writing skills. Both products would have value at the College. Connie Tuisku informed the committee that Ginger Pedersen had previously indicated that there are funds to pay for a College license for Research Companion so she suggested that the committee vote to move forward with that. It was unanimously agreed to request that a license be purchased for Research Companion.

Associate Dean Sheila Scott-Lubin will get pricing information on Pearson Writer and bring that information to the next committee meeting.

Source: None

Action: Connie Tuisku will pursue the purchase of Research Companion. Dean Sheila Scott-Lubin will find out the price of Pearson Writer.

ITEM 4. Review Sample Assessments

Discussion: The committee reviewed a general education embedded assessment instrument and corresponding packet that was submitted for this assessment cycle. The purpose of the review was to better understand what makes an assessment instrument effective and to enhance the committee members' skills in asking the right questions. The purpose of these training sessions is to help committee members become process experts, not content experts.

Source: General Education Embedded Assessments

Action: None

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe