

MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, February 3, 2012
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 ☒	Andrew Plotkin ☒	Carole Policy ☒
Syeda Qadri ☒	Helen Shub ☒	Debra-Anne Singleton ☒
Victor Slesinger ☒	Melissa Stonecipher ☒	Patrick Tierney ☒
Connie Tuisku ☒	Bobette Wolessensky ☒	

ITEM 1. Faculty Survey Results

Discussion: At the previous meeting, it was decided to create a survey for all faculty asking them to identify the top two problems they observe among their students in both oral and written communication skills. In order to create this survey, the Speech and English clusters were asked to prepare a list of the problems that they see as most pressing in their respective disciplines. From the suggestions provided by the content experts in the Speech and English clusters, the all-faculty survey was created. The results of this survey were shared with the committee. For English, the top three skills identified as most problematic were grammar, sentence fluency, and independent thought, in that order. For Speech, the top three skills identified were effective reasoning, effective delivery and organization, in that order.

It was noted that while the response rate was very good for full-time faculty, it was quite low for adjunct faculty. Upon review, it was determined that the survey invitation was only sent to full-time faculty and administrators. The committee discussed the possibility of sending the survey to adjuncts, but decided that in the interest of time (and considering that a good response was received from full-time faculty) the committee determined that the results already received are sufficient.

Data/data source: Online faculty survey.

Action: None.

ITEM 2. Rubric Development – Written and Oral Communications

Discussion: After much discussion, the members of the committee realized that before rubrics can be developed, it was necessary to determine how the assessments will take place. Two possible implementation methods were discussed. The first suggestion was to have the faculty use the rubrics and submit the results to the IRE office. This method would create some administrative difficulties in terms of the collection of the results, but more importantly, it would require faculty outside English and Speech to be able to use the rubrics effectively. While this is an important long-term goal, the committee felt that initially it would be best for the Gen Ed committee to grade the assignments. The second possible implementation method, which is the one the committee has chosen to pursue, is to have the IRE Office randomly select sections of appropriate courses, and students within those sections. The faculty teaching those courses will be asked to submit work from those students to the committee. The committee recognized that this method of collection will only work for written communication skills. They decided to address the issue of oral communications at a later meeting once the plan has been fully designed for written communication skills.

Helen Shub distributed to the committee the list of Gordon Rule courses. She suggested to the committee that since these courses require significant writing, these would be good courses from which to sample. Dr. Ginger Pedersen informed the committee that she is reviewing syllabi of the Gordon Rule courses and doing an inventory of what faculty report they are requiring vis-à-vis writing requirements. Dr. Pedersen will share her findings with the committee.

The committee unanimously decided that the student artifacts will be randomly selected from Gordon Rule classes and submitted to the Gen Ed committee for grading.

An observation was made that one of the important aspects of embedded assessment is to involve faculty in the process and that we should pay special attention to make sure that happens. A number of suggestions were made to achieve this:

1. Make the rubric available to participating faculty ahead of time. Provide workshops for faculty so they understand the dimensions of the rubric and how it will be used.
2. Hold a workshop on Development Day on the use and development of rubrics, using this rubric as an example.
3. Provide participating faculty with a resource page for students who need help in their written communication.
4. Professor Patrick Tierney volunteered to create a short video for participating faculty that will give an overview of the process and what their role is.

A subcommittee was created to draft a rubric for written communications based on the results of the faculty survey. This subcommittee consists of Professor Patrick Tierney, Professor Melissa Stonecipher, Karen Pain, Dr. Ginger Pedersen and Debra-Anne

Singleton. This subcommittee will bring the draft to the next committee meeting. Once the committee approves of the draft, it will be sent to the English cluster for their review and approval.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Dr. Pedersen will share the findings of her review of Gordon Rule syllabi with the committee at a subsequent meeting.

Professor Tierney will create a video for faculty whose sections are selected that will inform them about the process in general and the use of the rubric specifically.

A subcommittee will meet to draft a rubric for writing skills and will present the draft to the Gen Ed committee at the next meeting.

ITEM 3. Review Improvement Strategy Suggestions

Discussion: Ms. Shub informed the committee that she will be presenting to the Joint Deans and the Executive Leadership Council the committee's recommendations for improvement strategies based on the general education assessment results. She asked the committee to review the suggestions provided and to indicate any suggestions for changes, additions or deletions. It was observed that the project currently underway between the English and prep English/EAP clusters should be added.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: The current project between the English and prep English/EAP clusters will be added to the list of suggested improvement strategies.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:45 am.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe