

MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, February 11, 2011
11:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
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"/>		

ITEM 1. Final Review of General Education Learning Outcomes

Discussion: After the last committee meeting, Professor Tcherina Duncombe expressed a concern about the proposed revision of the Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning learning outcome. After some discussion through email, it was decided that this would be revisited during the next committee meeting. Helen Shub prepared a handout that showed the current learning outcome, the proposed revision and the additional revisions suggested by the members of the committee during the email discussion. The committee reviewed all the suggestions, had further discussion and revised the Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning learning outcome to read as follows:

“Apply mathematical and scientific principles to solve real-world problems.”

The committee then unanimously agreed that the revisions made to the general education learning outcomes and the general education philosophy statement were ready to be reviewed by the faculty as a whole.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: The IRE Office will prepare an online survey to be sent to all faculty allowing them to comment on the suggested revisions to the general education philosophy statement and learning outcomes.

ITEM 2. Review of Form for Inclusion of Courses in General Education Program

Discussion Dr. Ginger Pedersen presented the committee with the form used in the last general education review for faculty to request a course be included in the general education program. She reminded the committee that this applies only to courses that are “already on the books”; this is not the process to create a new course. Dr. Pedersen explained to the committee that in order for a course to be considered a general education course it should be general in nature; it should not be too specific within the discipline. She further explained that there has been a proliferation of general education courses throughout the country, however, the State of Florida recently administered a study that demonstrated that Palm Beach State College is right where it should be in terms of the courses included in its general education program.

Dr. Pedersen will make a few revisions to the current form including 1) the replacement of the general education philosophy statement and learning outcomes with the proposed revised versions; 2) the modification of the wording related to the Gordon Rule requirements based on the changes in Florida statute; and 3) other minor revisions in wording.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Dr. Pedersen will revise the form and distribute it to the committee for their review.

ITEM 3. Discussion of Lumina Report on Degree Qualifications

Discussion: Ms. Shub offered a brief summary of the Lumina report, giving an overview of its origins with the Bologna Process and the underlying reasoning of creating a framework which clearly illustrates what students should know and be able to do once they earn their degrees – at any level. While this is still in the developmental stage, the committee agreed that aspects of this project could be very useful in the assessment of the College’s general education program.

Data/data source: Lumina Foundation Report, “The Degree Qualifications Profile”

Action: N/A

ITEM 4. Discussion of Embedded Assessment

Discussion: Ms. Shub began the discussion with a reminder that one of the primary purposes of including embedded assessment in the College’s assessment of general education is to increase faculty involvement in the process and help foster a culture of assessment. By utilizing embedded assessments, there is more of an opportunity to make the assessment process a formative one, involving faculty in conversations with each other, inside and outside of their own disciplines.

The committee agreed that the administration of the Scenarios and the ETS Proficiency Profile will continue, and that beginning in fall 2011, that process will be augmented by introducing embedded assessment on a small scale through one or more pilot projects. Because the two learning outcomes that were targeted for improvement are communications and critical thinking, and because critical thinking will be the focus of the

QEP for the next five years, the committee selected communications as the learning outcome in which to begin introducing embedded assessment.

Ms. Shub described a number of approaches other colleges and universities utilize for embedded assessments, such as, common test items, common rubrics and submitting random selected artifacts to an assessment committee. At the next meeting, Ms. Shub will present the committee with examples from other institutions.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Ms. Shub will bring samples from other colleges and universities as to how they include embedded assessments in their overall assessment process.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe