

MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, October 8, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
ETA 101, Lake Worth

Attendance:	Louise Aurelien <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Childers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <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"/>	Carole Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Syeda Qadri <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Matilde Roig-Watnik <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"/>		

ITEM 1. Update on General Education Assessment

Discussion: Helen Shub updated the committee on the progress of the general education assessment. She indicated that the process was going very smoothly. Professors Victor Slesinger and Tcherina Duncombe happen to be teaching sections that have been included in the sample, so they were able to share with the committee their perspective on the assessment process. Both professors offered a positive view and said that their students responded well to the assessment.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action:

ITEM 2. Review of Rubrics

Discussion: Ms. Shub reminded the committee that they should all review their rubrics to make sure that they represent how the scenarios should be graded. She emphasized that the rubrics should be driven by the learning outcomes. A discussion ensued about the differences between holistic and analytic rubrics. Ms. Shub distributed to the committee a handout that demonstrated how an analytic rubric can be converted to a holistic rubric. The committee agreed that prior to the grading of the scenarios, each group should meet separately and decide upon the parameters for the grading of their particular scenario. These parameters should be reflected in the rubric.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action:

ITEM 3. Schedule Day(s) for Grading of Scenarios

Discussion: The committee decided that rather than meet as a large group to do the grading, it would be more efficient for each of the smaller groups to meet separately. Since there is only about a two-week time period to complete the grading, the committee felt that the more flexibility everyone had, the easier it would be to complete the project in the time allotted. It was decided that Ms. Shub will distribute the scenarios to the individual groups as soon as they are ready and the groups will decide among themselves when they will meet to do the grading. The assessment period is over on October 22nd, but several groups asked to have whatever scenarios they could have earlier than that so they could get a head start. All graded scenarios are due back to the IRE office no later than November 11th.

The groups for grading are as follows:

Ethical Thinking: Prof. Victor Slesinger, Dr. Ginger Pedersen, Prof. Joseph Millas

Communications: Prof. Misi Stonecipher, Prof. Carol Policy, Prof. Patrick Tierney

Global Awareness: Prof. Bobette Wolesensky, Ms. Marcella Montesinos

Personal Development: Prof. David Childers, Dr. Jennifer Campbell, Ms. Helen Shub

Quantitative Reasoning: Prof. Karen Pain, Prof. Tony Piccolino, Dr. Syeda Qadri

Critical Thinking: Prof. Tcherina Duncombe, Prof. Mattie Roig-Watnik, Prof. Karen Pain

Tech & Info Literacy: Prof. Connie Tuisku, Prof. Louise Aurelian

The committee determined that since the grading will take place in individual groups, it will not be necessary to meet on October 15th or 29th.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Ms. Shub will deliver the scenarios to the various groups as soon as they are ready. She will also cancel the previously scheduled meetings for October 15th and 29th. The next committee meeting is scheduled for November 12th.

ITEM 4. Discussion of Embedded Assessment

Discussion: The committee began a discussion about augmenting the assessment process in the future to include embedded assessments. This would allow assessments that would test more aspects of the learning outcomes in greater depth. It would also provide opportunities to test skills that do not fit into the scenario model very well, such as speaking and listening skills. It was suggested that as we move into this new arena that we try to find other vernacular rather than "Embedded Assessments". Some committee members felt that this might be off-putting to some faculty. There was general agreement with this idea and the committee decided to pursue this idea at a future meeting.

Another suggestion was to find ways for clusters to get together other than those occasions where they have to conduct business. It was felt that many clusters would find

discussions of assessment and learning very beneficial, but the cluster meetings are so full of business items that there is no time left for these types of conversations.

Professor Pain mentioned that there will be some overlap between what this committee is doing and what the QEP committee will be doing and suggested the idea of finding a way to blend or connect the two committees. Ms. Shub and Prof. Pain agreed to discuss this idea further after the meeting.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Prof. Pain and Ms. Shub will meet to discuss how the activities between the two committees can best be coordinated.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe