ITEM 1. **Gordon Rule**

Discussion: Dr. Irving Berkowitz requested that the General Education Committee review the writing requirements of a particular Gordon Rule course and determine if those requirements were in compliance with the Gordon Rule Statement as approved by the Academic Deans’ Council in April 2013. The specific areas that were reviewed included the type of writing assignments and the impact those assignments have on the calculation of the course grade. The committee unanimously voted that the course requirements for writing assignments were not in compliance with the Gordon Rule Statement.

The committee reviewed the Gordon Rule Statement and noted that there were several places where different language was used interchangeably, such as, “standard writing practices” and “effective writing standards.” It was suggested that common phrasing be employed throughout the statement. In addition, it was observed that the organization of the statement itself could lead to a misinterpretation of how much of the required writing should be formal, edited pieces written outside of regular class time. Professors Patrick Tierney and Melissa Stonecipher will revise the language and organization of the statement to provide better clarity. They will bring their suggestions to the next meeting for the committee’s review.

In addition to modifying the language of the Gordon Rule Statement, the committee began discussing creating support for non-English faculty in their application of the Gordon Rule Statement to their teaching. The committee discussed using the English writing rubric as the primary tool for faculty to grade Gordon Rule assignments. It was the opinion of the committee that the rubric provides a clear definition of what the elements of good writing are and that it is an appropriate tool for any faculty member to
use. The committee then reviewed the definition of “standard writing practices” as described in the Gordon Rule Statement and mapped each item onto the English writing rubric. At the next meeting, Professor’s Tierney and Stonecipher will present their revisions to the Gordon Rule Statement along with a formal alignment of the Statement and the English writing rubric. The committee will review these items and determine if the rubric should be the required grading tool for Gordon Rule writing assignments.

Source: Gordon Rule Statement, approved by the Academic Deans’ Council on April 4, 2013

Action: Helen Shub will prepare a written opinion reflecting the committee’s vote for Dr. Berkowitz.

Professors Patrick Tierney and Melissa Stonecipher will revise the Gordon Rule Statement for the committee’s review at the next meeting.

ITEM 2. Scenario Scoring

Discussion: Professor Patrick Tierney led a review of the scenario grading process, covering the differences between holistic and analytic rubrics. He reminded the committee that the goal is to get a broad view and do a holistic analysis of the student papers. The committee reviewed the rubric and graded several sample papers from the global awareness scenario to demonstrate how congruence in scoring should be achieved. The committee was then divided into three groups to score the three different scenarios. The assignments are as follows:

Information Literacy: Connie Tuisku
                       David Pena

Ethics: Tcherina Duncombe
        Emma Chow
        Ana Porro

Global Awareness: Warren Smith
                   Robin Fiedler

Professor Tierney reminded the graders to meet first as a group to read through several samples of the students’ papers to arrive at a common understanding of what the scores mean. All graded scenarios are due back to Helen Shub by November 15th.

Source: Scenarios and Rubrics

Action: The faculty will complete the scoring of the scenarios by November 15th.

ITEM 3. Review of Embedded Assessment Instruments

Discussion: This discussion was tabled until the next meeting

Source: N/A
Action: N/A

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 am.

Submitted by:

________________________
Helen Shub, Scribe