ITEM 1.  QEP Cohort Deliverables

Discussion:  Committee member had the opportunity to describe their ideas for the QEP deliverables. Karen Pain helped clarify the topics and details for those who had questions.

Data source:  None

Action:  Ms. Pain will repost the link to the Critical Thinking book for the cohort.

ITEM 2.  Name that Newsletter!

Discussion:  The committee held a robust discussion about the format, delivery mode, content and name of the newsletter. It was agreed that the primary purpose of the newsletter is to engage faculty and staff in the areas of assessment, critical thinking and related matters. A suggestion was made to create an advisory board, including students, to help guide the direction of the newsletter.

Suggested names for the newsletter included:

GASP
Mind Matters
Critical Thoughts
Critical Dimensions
Thinking Upgrade
It was agreed that although critical thinking is an important aspect of the newsletter, the name should encompass more than just critical thinking and reflect the broader scope of the newsletter. Final decisions about the newsletter were tabled until then next joint committee meeting with the QEP Implementation Team on November 2\textsuperscript{nd}.
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Action: Decision tabled until November 2\textsuperscript{nd} meeting.

**ITEM 3. Gen Ed Committee Deliverables**

Discussion: Helen Shub reviewed and clarified the expectations for the coming year. The schedule that was constructed at the beginning of the year can be used as a guide, but no one should feel locked into it. The goals are to complete the deliverables by the end of the year; the timing of how it gets done can be flexible.

Ms. Shub reminded the committee that the Gen Ed committee members are not responsible for creating or delivering QEP workshops, although they will be asked to assist as needed. Instead of the QEP workshops, the Gen Ed faculty will be working on developing adjunct training, a workshop on Turnitin.com and improved procedures for communication between the faculty and SLCs.
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Action: None

**ITEM 4. Gen Ed Assessment Update**

Discussion: Ms. Shub provided the committee with an update on the embedded assessment pilot. Overall, cooperation has been good, but the process has raised a number of questions about the Gordon Rule policy. The committee reviewed the actual Gordon Rule and Dr. Ginger Pedersen described the history of the implementation of the Gordon Rule at the College. The committee agreed that more discussion is required to address the issue of consistency regarding the implementation of the Gordon Rule.

Ms. Shub also provided an update on the regular general education assessment. She indicated that the process was proceeding on schedule. She distributed the list of sections included in the random sample of classes being assessed and asked committee
members to select faculty members to contact. This is meant as an additional way to offer support to those faculty who are included in the sample that may have questions or concerns about the assessment.

A discussion about the scoring of the scenarios led to the creation of the following grading teams:

- Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning: Karen Pain and Ana Porro
- Global Awareness: Robin Fiedler and Warren Smith
- Communications: Melissa Stonecipher, Debra-Anne Singleton and Marcie Pachter
- Ethics: Patrick Tierney, Ginger Pedersen and Tcherina Duncombe
- Information Literacy: Connie Tuisku, David Pena and Robin Hoggins-Blake
- Critical Thinking: QEP Implementation Team

Data source: Administrative Rule (FAC) 6A-10.030 (The Gordon Rule)

Action: None
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