Meeting Minutes  
General Education Committee  
Friday, September 5, 2014  
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
CPB 203, Lake Worth

ITEM 1. Welcome and Introductions

Discussion: Professor Patrick Tierney welcomed everyone as the new chair of the committee. He indicated that we changed meeting time for this one meeting because of the conflict of scheduling with student convocation. Normally we will meet at 10:00 am.

Source: None

Action: None

ITEM 2. Recruits from South Campus

Discussion: Professor Tierney noted that the committee currently has no representation from the south campus. He asked for recommendations of any faculty from the south campus who would be a good addition to the committee. Professor Tracy Ciucci said she will email a suggestion.

Source: None

Action: None

Attendance: | Irving Berkowitz ✓ | Jennifer Campbell ✓ |
---|---|---|
Emma Chow ✓ | Tracy Ciucci ✓ | Tcherina Duncombe ✓ |
John Gaul ☒ | David Knopp ✓ | 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 3. **Scenarios**

Discussion: Helen Shub reviewed the process for the administration of the Scenarios with the committee. There are four scenarios, one for each institutional learning outcome—critical thinking, ethics, global awareness, and information literacy. The assessment will take place during the fall semester, and the grading will occur in the spring. In order to avoid confusion with the instructions recently sent to all faculty about the general education assessment process, Ms. Shub will delay sending information about the Scenarios until next week.

Source: None

Action: None

ITEM 4. **Development Day and Gordon Rule**

Discussion: Ms. Shub reminded the committee of what has been done with regard to the Gordon Rule and what issues were left unresolved. She distributed the most recent draft of the Gordon Rule Statement along with the draft rubric that the committee developed last semester. There are several issues that remain unresolved:

1. How much the quality of writing will count toward the overall course grade;
2. How feedback will be provided to the students; and
3. The finalization of the word counts for each discipline.

There was unanimous agreement among committee members that the presentation of this material to the faculty is of critical importance. The faculty must be provided with clear guidelines that specify what the minimum expectations are while at the same time respecting the faculty’s academic freedom. After lengthy discussion, the committee unanimously agreed that the rest of the faculty should have a similar opportunity to engage in the same type of open discussion. In the past, faculty input related to the Gordon Rule has been gathered through the use of an electronic survey. Providing feedback to a survey, while useful, does not allow the kind of give and take that an open discussion does.

The committee therefore recommends that at the next Development Day each cluster containing Gordon Rule courses with writing requirements will be asked to select a minimum of two representatives from each discipline from every campus to join a discussion about the Gordon Rule. This discussion will be facilitated by two committee members and will have the purpose of giving faculty the opportunity to provide feedback on the statement and the rubric. The presentation at the general session will remind faculty that the purpose of this process is to raise the bar and hold students accountable for their writing. Professor Tracy Ciucci volunteered to represent the committee at the general session on Development Day and present the overall message to the faculty. The committee’s goal is to send this request to the faculty as soon as possible so they can decide who they want to send to the Development Day breakout session. The invitation should indicate that they are all invited, but a minimum of two representatives per area,
per campus is required. It was also recommended that we include the associate deans in the correspondence so they can assist in encouraging responses from the faculty. Ms. Shub will follow up with Dr. Sass for her approval.

Source: Drafts of Gordon Rule Statement revision and rubric

Action: Helen Shub will discuss the committee’s suggestion for Development Day with Dr. Sharon Sass. Professor Tierney will contact Robin Fiedler to see if she will assist in the presentation on Development Day.

ITEM 5. General Education Embedded Assessment Review

Discussion: The committee selected a sample of general education common assignments submitted from faculty clusters to review. The purpose of the review was to assist committee members in strengthening their skills as assessment facilitators by practicing the skill of asking leading questions. These types of questions are designed to help faculty think about how their assessments are measuring student learning and how the use of the assessment results can lead to improvements.

Professor Tierney asked Professor Warren Smith to describe to the committee how the common assessment was developed for ECO2013 and Professor Tony Piccolino, MAC1105. As a result of this discussion the committee developed a good sense of what kind of questions they might have for a cluster when facilitating a discussion about their assessments. For example:

1. Do the course learning outcomes represent what the faculty actually intend to teach in the course?
2. Do any of the course learning outcomes need to be rewritten?
3. Does the assessment instrument align with the selected course learning outcome?
4. Does the wording of the outcome match the type of assignment that is given? In other words, if the outcome use the term “Describe”, can the instrument be multiple choice or would an essay be more appropriate?
5. Are we measuring what we purport to be measuring?
6. What level of Bloom’s Taxonomy are the course level outcomes written at?

Professor Tierney reminded the committee that the focus of these discussions should be good practice, rather than accreditation. He also suggested that it is best when we start to have these meetings that the facilitator be someone who isn't a content expert in the particular area being discussed. By having a facilitator from outside the discipline, it reduces the perception that the facilitator is there to direct how things should be done and reinforces the idea that he or she is there to help the participants ask themselves the right questions.

Source: Sample general education assessment instruments

Action: None
ITEM 6.  Next Meeting

Discussion:  The next meeting is scheduled for October 3rd. The location may be changed to ETA 101 if it is a multi-media room.

Source:  None

Action:  Ms. Shub will ascertain if ETA 101 is a multi-media room. If it is, and if the room is available, the meeting notice for the next meeting will be updated to reflect the new location. Otherwise, the location will remain in the CBP building.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe