



CLUSTER AGENDA
January 5, 2015
9:30 am – 10:50 pm
Lake Worth Campus

ITEM 1. Welcome

Discussion: Cluster was welcomed back by Chair Victor Gent.

Data/data source: n/a

Action: n/a

ITEM 2. Approval of minutes from October 20, 2014 meeting.

Discussion: n/a

Data/data source: 10/20/2014 Minutes presented via e-mail.

Action: The cluster approved the minutes by acclamation.

ITEM 3. Speech Contest

Discussion: Cluster needs to review speech contest guidelines and judging form, as per last meeting.

Data/data source: n/a

Action: Marcie Pachter will e-mail specific wording of topic, potential speech contest dates, and guidelines and judging form from previous contest and cluster will finalize all materials.

ITEM 4. General Education Assessment

Discussion: Cluster discussed the inputting of data for common assessment. There was a question as to when cluster would receive this data to review and analyze. Cluster also discussed need to review course learning outcomes in general, as it has been a few years since our last learning outcome review.

Data/data source: n/a

Action: Cluster will review existing learning outcomes, plus learning outcomes at comparable courses at other institutions. Cluster will begin discussion of updating of outcomes via e-mail and at next cluster meeting.

ITEM 5. Gordon Rule

Discussion: Pat Tierney, chair of the General Education Committee, led the cluster a discussion of the current draft copy of the “Gordon Rule.” The cluster reiterated its support of writing across the curriculum and promoting quality writing no matter the course. However, as expressed at last cluster meeting, the speech cluster has specific concerns regarding the current draft and made the following suggestions, observations and comments:

Cluster believes the rubric should only be a suggestion for application to the Gordon Rule (Pat Tierney did emphasize it is only a suggestion, not a requirement)

Cluster questions the need for a list of writing assignments – if there is a list of “not approved” assignments, wouldn’t anything else then qualify as “approved”?

Cluster had some question as to “note-taking” – if it meets criteria in Gordon Rule, shouldn’t that be up to instructor discretion?

Cluster believes “Writings with extensive quotations or paraphrases” and “homework assignments with responses copied from textbooks or reading materials ...” are very similar, therefore redundant

Cluster strongly suggests that the statement that reads “Writing assignments must be incorporated into the designated course curriculum and must be computed in the course final grade in such a way that the writing component will have a significant impact on the course grade” be edited down to “Writing assignments must be incorporated into the designated course curriculum and must be computed in the course final grade.” The word “significant” is too ambiguous. Should a learning outcome be included in Gordon Rule classes that address writing? Otherwise, how can it have a significant impact on a grade? What if a student does not meet the minimum word count but has fulfilled all learning outcomes? Can they pass the class? (However, cluster maintains it should not be mandated that Gordon Rule assignments be a certain percentage of a grade in any course.)

Cluster strongly suggests that the word “documented” be removed before “feedback” – sometimes feedback, even on writing, is verbal and done in conference with a student. A suggestion of “formal feedback” or just “feedback” was made.

Cluster strongly suggests eliminating the mention of the rubric in the actual guidelines, as the wording does imply the requirement of its usage and could easily be misinterpreted.

Cluster strongly suggests that “At least one of the writing assignments must be a polished, edited piece written outside of regular class time” be changed to “At least one of the writing assignments must be a polished, edited piece.” There seems to be no clear reason this can’t be done in class if the instructor so chooses.

Cluster believes that plagiarism should be a part of the discussion of writing across the curriculum. Faculty need stronger support and resources – how can we deal with students who are

“repeat offenders,” especially across multiple courses? We need a clear way to deal with and track these students while also respecting their legal rights.

Data/data source: Draft copy of “Implementation of Florida State Board of Education Administrative Rule 6A-10.030 (‘Gordon Rule’) Writing Requirements”

Action: Pat Tierney will take the cluster’s observations and suggestions back to the General Education Committee at its January meeting, with Marcie Pachter there to provide clarification.

OTHER. Adjournment. Lori Crane moved to adjourn, David Rossman seconded. All voted in favor at 10:50 am.

Attendance:

Victor Gent (Chair)

Marcie Pachter (Scribe),

Lori Crane,

Leonie Escoffery,

Steve Frishman,

Michelle Biferie,

Megan Tomei,

David Childers,

Sharon Martin,

David Rossman,

Kim Kamuca

Guests: Patrick Tierney

Absent: n/a

Submitted by:

Marcie Pachter, Scribe

c. Minutes Distribution List