

**MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, October 28, 2011
10:00 p.m. – 12:00 p.m.
ETA 101, Lake Worth**

Attendance:	Diane Bifano ☒	Susan Caldwell ☒
Jennifer Campbell ☒	Tracy Ciucci ☒	Tcherina Duncombe ☒
Robin Hoggins-Blake ☒	Marcella Montesinos ☒	Marci Pachter ☒
Karen Pain ☒	Ginger Pedersen ☒	David Pena ☒
Anthony Piccolino ☒	Carole Policy ☒	Syeda Qadri ☒
Helen Shub ☒	Victor Slesinger ☒	Melissa Stonecipher ☒
Patrick Tierney ☒	Connie Tuisku ☒	Bobette Wolessky ☒

ITEM 1. Review of SACS Visit

Discussion: Helen Shub provided the committee with a recap of the SACS visit. Although the SACS team asked the committee many challenging questions, the visiting team gave us no recommendations. Professor Karen Pain provided the committee with an overview of the QEP committees' interviews with the SACS team and reported that they had equally challenging questions and observations for the QEP committee members. The SACS team did make two recommendations with regard to the QEP, the first having to do with revising the timetable and the second with redesigning the assessment plan to measure the learning outcomes directly.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: None

ITEM 2. Review of Development Day

Discussion: English/Prep English/EAP Discussion
Professor Melissa Stonecipher updated the committee on the special "round table" held on Development Day for selected credit English, prep English and EAP faculty. This group discussed a draft proposal presented by Professors Dan McGavin and Rachel McDermott to revise and align the learning outcomes to create a continuum from prep English/EAP through ENC 1101. Professor Stonecipher reported Professors McGavin and McDermott presented their proposal in an excellent fashion and the reactions from the group were mostly positive. Some faculty had concerns about the placement issue, but that was

beyond the scope of the discussion since there is a new placement exam (PERT) which is, so far, untested at Palm Beach State. In addition, it was acknowledged that the open door policy at the College creates some challenges in terms of the preparedness of entering students to do college-level work, but the group recognized that is an expected feature of an open admission institution. Some faculty expressed concern that things like this had been tried before, but the group facilitators assured everyone that they are now operating from a real platform for change. This effort is entirely faculty-led and has great momentum behind it. A committee will be formed to explore this matter further.

Round Table Discussions

Helen Shub asked the committee members to share their experiences as facilitators of the round table discussions on Development Day. Some of the committee members had very good experiences and reported robust discussions. Other committee members were surprised by the negativity they encountered. Some faculty indicated that they were insulted by the assignment, that they felt it made the assumption that they didn't know how to teach critical thinking already. Others commented that they didn't like the structure of the activity which included writing on post-its and using poster boards. There was also mixed reaction to how the table assignments were handled. Some faculty liked the idea of being with instructors outside their own discipline, but others indicated that they prefer to be with those of their own discipline.

The facilitators then commented on their own experiences in the round tables. Many of them reported that no one in their room would volunteer to be the scribe so they had to act as facilitator and scribe. It was recommended that next time a similar activity is undertaken that the scribes be selected and trained ahead of time.

Professor Pain and Ms. Shub will consolidate the results from the round tables and distribute them via email to all faculty. The results will also be brought to the committee for further discussion as to how to best follow up on ideas that were generated in the discussion.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Professor Pain and Ms. Shub will compile the results from the round tables and distribute them to all faculty. The results will also be brought to the General Education Assessment Committee for further discussion.

ITEM 3. General Education Assessment Process - Discussion

Discussion: Helen Shub shared with the committee comments from the faculty who participated in the Gen Ed assessment. Many of the comments were very positive and others were critical of the process. In particular, a number of the participating faculty indicated that they were not sufficiently aware of what was happening and what was expected of them. The committee discussed this at length and decided that in future implementations, the committee members will act as the proctors. In addition, Ms. Shub will make an effort to personally meet with all the faculty members whose classes have been selected to be part of the sample.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: None

ITEM 4. Scenario Grading

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. He further instructed everyone 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. The committee felt that an important part of this process is for each group to ask themselves after the grading process is complete whether the assessment provided us with the information we need to know. The committee felt that the real learning process for the committee will come after all the scenarios are graded. All graded scenarios are due back to Helen Shub by November 14th.

The faculty who were not yet assigned to a group are now assigned as follows: Tracy Ciucci will be working with the Ethics group and Robin Hoggins-Blake will be working with the Information Literacy Group.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: The scenarios were distributed to the different groups and are due back to Ms. Shub by November 14th.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:45 am.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe