

**MINUTES**  
**General Education Assessment Committee**  
**Friday, December 9, 2011**  
**10:00 p.m. – 12:00 p.m.**  
**ETA 101, Lake Worth**

---

<b>Attendance:</b>	Diane Bifano <input type="checkbox"/>	Susan Caldwell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Ciucci <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Robin Hoggins-Blake <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marcella Montesinos <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marci Pachter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Pena <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Piccolino <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 Wolessky <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ITEM 1. Reports on Grading Process**

Discussion: The meeting began with committee members sharing any issues or observations that arose in the process of grading the scenarios.

Connie Tuisku said that the group who graded the Information Literacy scenarios noticed that there was inconsistency in how students interpreted the term “popular culture”. Rather than understanding it as cultural activities that reflect the taste of the general population, many students interpreted it to mean which culture was more popular than others. It is recommended that in future administrations of the scenarios that a definition of the term “popular culture” be included. The group also noted that some additional tweaking needs to be done on the essay questions as well as two of the multiple choice questions.

Professor Melissa Stonecipher reported that the Communications scenario responses were by and large not written as true essays. Students provided introductions, conclusions and answered the three questions, but there was no synthesis. It was suggested that the time provided may not be enough to write a good essay or to do revisions. It was recommended that the committee review this scenario for possible future revisions.

Professor Victor Slesinger noted that there was a wide range of writing skills – some very good and some very poor. He also commented that one issue that arose with the Ethics scenario is that students were awarded points for providing solutions to the problem presented regardless of how good or bad the solutions were. A discussion ensued about

possibly clarifying the instructions for the students and also to be clear that the actual Gen Ed outcome is what is being measured by the scenario.

Another issue that impacted a number of the scenarios was that students had a tendency to simply restate the prompt rather than offer any kind of analysis. It was suggested that in designing the rubric a category for “off-topic” could be added. The committee decided that the rubrics will be re-evaluated in the spring semester and that they should all be consistent in terms of what level of skill each number on the grading scale represents.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: The committee will review all the rubrics in the spring semester.

## **ITEM 2. Review and Discussion of Assessment Results**

Discussion: Ms. Shub distributed to the committee the results of the general education assessment. These results included the following:

- A template of all general education results;
- Charts that display the general education results in graphic form;
- A template of the results for the institutional measures for the Associate in Arts program; and
- Correlation coefficients for both the Proficiency Profile and Scenarios, correlating the scores with age, GPA, total credit hours earned and general education credit hours earned.

The correlation coefficients, at first glance, seemed to indicate that there was no correlation between the number of general education courses completed and results on the assessment. However, Dr. Ginger Pedersen pointed out that because the way the sample was selected (courses whose mean number of credits completed was 45 or greater), there was a restriction in range of those included. It was also observed that because we are not measuring “value added”, a credit hour analysis is not really meaningful. It was suggested that a request be made to the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness to correlate the assessment results with the students’ entry level test scores.

After a lengthy discussion, the committee voted to select Communications and Critical Thinking as the outcomes to target for improvement.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: A request will be made to the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness to see if it is feasible to calculate the correlation between assessment results and entry level test scores.

## **ITEM 3. Discussion of Suggested Improvement Strategies**

Discussion: The committee reviewed the improvement strategies from the prior assessment cycle to see if any of the strategies should be continued in their present form or continued with revisions. In addition, the committee discussed a number of new ideas. The following recommendations were made by the committee:

- Develop a common rubric to be used in Gordon Rule classes to assess writing skills.
- Create interactive workshops that deal with the development and use of rubrics.
- Explore the possibility of including an information literacy module into the ENC1101 curriculum.
- Plan meetings in which full-time faculty and adjuncts have the opportunity to meet together and share ideas.
- Present sessions at Academic Development Day. A specific suggestion was made to feature faculty who presented ideas at the last Development Round Table discussions that other faculty expressed interest in hearing more about.

A lengthy discussion took place about writing skills among our students. A number of committee members commented on what they have observed in their own classrooms as well as anecdotal evidence they have heard from their colleagues. Professor Tcherina Duncombe described an assignment she is currently using in her microbiology classes. She asks her students to read a scientific article and present to the class the essence of the article, focusing on the key points of where, what, who and when. She then asks them to submit a one page written summary to ascertain if what they presented matches what they put in writing. What she is finding is that there is a great deal of “cutting and pasting” where students are not putting the material into their own words. In those instances, the students are required to redo their work. It was suggested that this could be something that could be shared with other faculty in the College as an example of how assessing and reinforcing the teaching communication skills can be incorporated into courses other than English.

The committee discussed the possibility of developing an improvement strategy that would address communication between faculty and the Student Learning Centers. This idea will be more fully addressed at the next committee meeting.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: None

Meeting Adjourned at 11:45 am.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe