

MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, January 7, 2011
10:00 p.m. – 12:00 noon
ETA 101, Lake Worth

Attendance:	Louise Aurelien <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robin Hoggins-Blake <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Millas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marcella Montesinos <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Piccolino <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Andrew Plotkin <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Carole Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Syeda Qadri <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Helen Shub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Victor Slesinger <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Melissa Stonecipher <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Patrick Tierney <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bobette Wolesensky <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Guest: Sharon Sass <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

ITEM 1. General Education Review

Discussion: Helen Shub welcomed the committee back for the semester and introduced Dr. Sharon Sass, Vice-President of Academic Affairs. Dr. Sass explained to the committee that every three years the College forms an ad hoc committee to review the content of the general education program. This entails a review of the general education philosophy and learning outcomes, and provides an opportunity for clusters to make a case for including additional courses as general education offerings. The review also involves the examination of the existing general education courses to determine if any should be deleted from the program.

Dr. Sass informed everyone that while in the past the general education review was the function of an ad hoc committee, it makes more sense now to assign that function to this committee since they already have a thorough understanding of the general education program. The committee members all agreed with this and expressed a great interest in moving forward with this assignment.

Dr. Ginger Pedersen spoke next and explained in detail how the process of general education review works. The first step for the committee will be to review, and possibly revise, the general education philosophy. The committee will then review the general education learning outcomes and determine if any revisions are necessary there. It was suggested that the learning outcomes could be made more succinct and measurable. Once the committee is satisfied with their revisions, the philosophy and learning outcomes will be sent to the rest of the faculty for their input. Later in this semester, the faculty will be asked to submit recommendations for courses to be added to the general education program along with justification for those recommendations. Once the

nominations for additional courses are submitted, faculty members will be provided with an opportunity to appear before this committee to make a brief presentation about why their course should be added to the general education program. The committee will vote on each course and each course that is accepted will then go through the curriculum process. Any changes to the general education program, philosophy and learning outcomes will be reflected in the next college catalog.

Dr. Pedersen then led the committee in a brainstorming session to revise the current General Education Philosophy Statement. The first step was to list ideas that describe the essence of a general education program. Following that, the committee decided to work as one large group to incorporate these ideas into a new philosophy statement. Dr. Pedersen reminded the committee that the General Education Philosophy Statement should reflect the College Mission. After much deliberation, the committee developed a draft of a new philosophy statement. This statement will be typed up and distributed to the committee for their further review.

Next, Ms. Shub distributed the current set of general education learning outcomes for the committee's consideration. The committee was also provided with sample learning outcomes from other institutions, as well as the Florida state-wide learning outcomes. After reviewing all of the documentation and considering their experience in assessing the current learning outcomes this past year, the committee decided to revise the general education learning outcomes. The wording was revised for Communications, Global Awareness, Ethics, Quantitative Reasoning and Technology and Information Literacy. It was decided to wait until the following meeting to revise the Critical Thinking learning outcome. In addition to revising the wording of the learning outcomes, the committee also recommended changing "Quantitative Reasoning" to "Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning" and "Technology and Information Literacy" to "Information Literacy". Finally, the committee felt that it was not necessary to have a separate learning outcome for Personal Development, since mastery of the other learning outcomes will lead to competence in the area of personal development. Based on this idea, the committee recommended deleting the Personal Development learning outcome. Ms. Shub will type up the revisions of the learning outcomes and distribute them to the committee for further discussion at the next meeting.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Dr. Pedersen will type up the new philosophy statement onto a template that has space for revisions. Ms. Shub will distribute the template to the committee via email and will bring all submissions of revisions back to the committee at the next meeting for further discussion.

Ms. Shub will type up the revised Learning Outcomes and email them to the committee for further discussion.

Meeting Adjourned at noon

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe