

**MINUTES**  
**General Education Assessment Committee**  
**Friday, September 23, 2011**  
**10:00 p.m. – 12:00 p.m.**  
**ETA 101, Lake Worth**

---

<b>Attendance:</b>	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 ☒
Lynn Trezise - Guest	Brian Findley - Guest	Carleton Chernekoff - Guest
Daniel McGavin – Guest	Ana Porro - Guest	

**ITEM 1. Development Day Round Table Discussion**

Discussion: Helen Shub welcomed the guests from the QEP Implementation committee and explained to everyone that the first topic of the meeting was to discuss the round tables planned for the upcoming Development Day. She informed the committee that some initial discussion had taken place and three topics were identified: 1) Critical thinking; 2) Writing skills; and 3) Plagiarism. Drafts of questions and a reporting template for the round tables were shared with the committee for its feedback. She also noted that Dr. Sass requested that all the members of the Gen Ed and QEP Implementation committees act as facilitators for the round tables.

A lengthy discussion took place in which a number of ideas were brought forth about how best to get attendees to participate in the discussion, how to record the outcomes, how to disseminate the information, etc. The final determination of the committee was as follows:

1. Three topics are too many. The committee recommended that it be narrowed to just critical thinking. It was observed, however, that both writing and plagiarism can easily be incorporated into the discussion, especially with prompting from the facilitators. Examples of types of prompts include:
  - a. How do the participants include writing that encourages critical thinking?
  - b. What strategies do they use to combat plagiarism?

- c. How do they ensure that writing is authentic?
- d. What kind of questions do you ask that don't have a single, correct answer?

Ms. Shub will contact Dr. Sass and inform her of the committee's recommendation.

2. The committee members requested training and specific information about what to cover at the round tables. It was suggested that a short introductory video be created that could be showed to each of the round tables so that everyone receives consistent information. Professor Karen Pain and Helen Shub will follow up with this suggestion and work on creating the video.
3. The committee decided that the best approach for holding the round table discussions was after the introductory video, each participant will be given some samples of how critical thinking can be applied in a variety of disciplines. At that point, each round table will give its participants a short time to come up with ways that he or she incorporates critical thinking into teaching and assessment. Large Post It papers will be posted around the room with topical labels, such as, "In-Class Assignments", "Group Projects", "Facilitated Discussion" etc. The participants will then go around the room and write down their ideas on the appropriate charts. Once this exercise is completed, the round table participants will discuss and share the ideas presented. The participants will also be asked to consider the following two questions:
  - a. Can any trends or commonalities be identified from the responses?
  - b. How can discussions like this be of most use to faculty?
4. Each facilitator will select a scribe. The role of the scribe will be to record the variety of ideas for instruction and assessment.
5. It was suggested that an item be placed on the cluster agenda for each cluster to reflect on the round table discussions they all attended and to have each cluster indicate on their cluster minutes the three best/most useful ideas they heard at the round tables. Ms. Shub will follow up with Dr. Sass about this suggestion.
6. An email should be sent to faculty prior to Development Day asking them to come prepared to discuss critical thinking strategies and assessments at their round tables. Examples should be provided in the email. The committee agreed that by "priming the pump" in this way, faculty will have the opportunity to prepare for the meeting, which will allow for much more robust conversation. Ms. Shub will work with Professor Pain to prepare the wording of the email and ask Dr. Sass if she will send it to faculty.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Ms. Shub and Professor Pain and will follow up with Dr. Sass on the following committee recommendations: 1) Reduce the number of topics to just critical thinking; 2) Prepare introductory video; 3) Include cluster agenda item to review round table discussions; and 4) Send email to clusters prior to Development Day.

Note: After the meeting, Ms. Shub had an opportunity to speak with Dr. Sass and she indicated that plagiarism will be included on every cluster's agenda for discussion so there is no need to specifically include it as part of the round tables.

## **ITEM 2. Assessment Update/Rubrics/Plans for Grading Scenarios**

Discussion: Helen Shub gave the committee an overview of how the general education assessment is progressing. Several of the committee members have classes that are part of the assessment and they shared their experiences. In general, Ms. Shub reported that the process is going very smoothly; each year we get more experienced and have fewer and fewer problems. There is good support and cooperation from both the administration and the faculty.

One unanticipated issue that arose in this year's implementation was that there was a larger than normal percentage of students who were selected for more than one assessment. This probably happened because this year the classes that were selected for the sample consisted of students whose median number of completed credits was 45 or greater. Last assessment cycle, the median was only 35. This change resulted in a larger percentage of high-level courses being included in the sample. It is very likely that students in an advanced math class might also be enrolled in an advanced science class, so this is probably the reason for the added duplication. Ms. Shub sent an email out to the associate deans with specific instructions on how to handle a situation if a student has already taken one assessment.

Ms. Shub distributed the most recent version of the rubrics and asked committee members to make sure that the rubrics measure the learning outcomes, especially since the learning outcomes were revised earlier this year.

The committee agreed that the scenarios should be graded in the same fashion that they were last cycle. Rather than call a meeting, each group will take the responsibility for the grading on their own time. The groups for grading are as follows:

### Critical Thinking

Patrick Tierney  
Tcherina Duncombe  
Marci Pachter

### Ethics

Ginger Pedersen  
Victor Slesinger

### Global Awareness

Bobette Wolesensky  
Marcella Montesinos

### Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

Anthony Piccolino  
Karen Pain

Information Literacy

Connie Tuisku

David Pena

Communications

Melissa Stonecipher

Carole Policy

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Helen Shub will follow up with those who missed the meeting to see which group would be most appropriate for them to join.

**ITEM 3. Pilot Studies and Embedded Assessment**

Discussion: This topic was tabled until the next meeting.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action:

Meeting Adjourned at noon.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe