

**Meeting Minutes**  
**General Education Committee**  
**Friday, November 22, 2013**  
**10:00a.m. – 12:00 noon**  
**CPB 201, Lake Worth**

---

<b>Attendance:</b>	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emma Chow <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Barbara Edgar <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robin Fiedler <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Knopp <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
David Pena <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ana Porro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Helen Shub, Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Debra-Anne Singleton <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Warren Smith <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Melissa Stonecipher <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Patrick Tierney <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Guest: Dean Leonard Bruton <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**ITEM 1.      General Education Review**

Discussion:      Dean Ginger Pedersen led the committee in a discussion about how the new state core curriculum will affect the current general education program. The core list of courses for each area of general education does not always coincide with how the College distributed the courses into tiers within each area. The effect of the state requirements, if any, is listed below.

- Communications – no effect
- Humanities – requires adjustment to maintain College’s policy requiring students to enroll in one literature course and one appreciation course to fulfill the requirements of this area.
- Math – no effect other than to provide different instructions for course selection in the catalog.
- Natural Sciences – no effect other than to provide different instructions for course selection in the catalog.
- Social Sciences – no effect other than to provide different instructions for course selection in the catalog.

The other major issue that the committee discussed was Area 6 of the general education program (Health and Foreign Language). Last year, the College revised its general education learning outcomes to align with the five areas of general education listed above. As a consequence, Area 6 does not align with any of the new learning outcomes.

After lengthy discussion, the following recommendation for revisions to the general education program were approved by the General Education Committee:

1. The list of core courses for Humanities includes an Introduction to Literature course which the College does not currently offer. If this course were to be developed by the English cluster and included in the core, it would be possible to maintain the College's philosophy that all AA degree students be required to fulfill their Humanities requirement by selecting one literature and one appreciation course. The committee, therefore recommends that an Introduction to Literature course be developed and included in the list of core courses for the Humanities. In addition, revised instructions for course selection within this area need to be provided.
2. Provide revised instructions for course selection for Math, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences.
3. Because the assessment of the general education program will take place through the learning outcomes aligned with the five areas of general education listed above, it will be impossible to assess courses that are not contained within one of those areas. Given that the assessment of the Health and Foreign Language courses will no longer be possible through the general education assessment process, the committee recommends that Area 6 be removed from the general education program.

Source: State Core Curriculum; College General Education Curriculum

Action: Helen Shub will present these recommendations to the Academic Deans and faculty for discussion.

## **ITEM 2. Gordon Rule**

Discussion: Professor Patrick Tierney and Helen Shub led a discussion regarding the Gordon Rule. They explained how they revised the statement to make it internally consistent and clear. They also presented a draft of a rubric and demonstrated how it aligns with the Gordon Rule Statement. Issues that were discussed included:

- What should the minimum standard be for how the Gordon Rule will impact a student's grade?
- Should this minimum standard apply to each writing assignment or to the student's overall grade in the course? It was noted that if a minimum is applied to each writing assignment, and the writing assignments are only a percentage of the overall grade, the writing could in that case account for only a small percentage of the student's overall grade.
- The intention is to hold students accountable for their writing. College-level writing should be expected; poor writing should have a negative impact on their grade.
- The purpose of the rubric is to provide feedback on writing that is below college-level. If a student's writing is competent, there should be no impact on his or her grade.

After lengthy discussion, the committee decided upon the following:

- A survey will be sent to faculty showing the current wording for the Gordon Rule Statement and the revised version, with strikeouts for deletions and underline for additions, as appropriate. Faculty will be asked to offer feedback, especially as it relates to their ability to apply the Gordon Rule to their classes.

- Faculty feedback will be reviewed by the General Education Committee and revisions, as necessary will be made to the Gordon Rule Statement. Following this, the statement will be sent to the Academic Deans' Council for approval.
- On Development Day, the approved Gordon Rule Statement will be presented to faculty. In addition, they will be shown the rubric developed by the General Education Committee. This rubric is meant to be a framework or guideline. Clusters will be asked to develop their own rubric(s) that incorporate content as well as the five elements of the Gordon Rule rubric.

The anticipated phases for this process are as follows:

Phase One (January – February 2014)

Revise and approve the new Gordon Rule Statement

Develop sample rubric to be utilized as a guideline

Phase Two (Spring 2014 Development Day)

Present to faculty the overall plan, the revised statement and the sample rubric

Phase Three (March – April 2014)

Clusters develop rubrics

Source: Gordon Rule Statement and draft of Gordon Rule rubric

Action: Helen Shub will prepare and distribute a survey asking for feedback on the revisions to the Gordon Rule Statement.

### **ITEM 3. Review of Embedded Assessments**

Discussion: Helen Shub reviewed with the committee the embedded assessments developed for each course by the various general education clusters. It was determined that when the clusters receive their aggregated assessment results, they should also receive suggestions for "best practices" in developing assessments. Each cluster will be asked during the spring semester to not only develop improvement strategies, but to also re-evaluate their course learning outcomes. They will further be asked to confirm that their assessment instruments actually assess the learning outcome they have selected and to ensure that the assessments are of good quality and provide enough information to allow for the development of meaningful improvement strategies, when applicable.

Each committee member will review the Linda Suskie book and the assessments submitted by each cluster. They will send to Helen Shub their observations and recommendations for suggestions to be communicated to the clusters. Ms. Shub will compile this information into a short, concise piece for distribution to faculty when they receive their cluster's results from the general education assessment.

Source: Embedded assessments

Action: A document will be prepared for faculty to help them enhance the quality of the assessments being used for the general education embedded assessment.

#### **ITEM 4. Sign up for Activities and Deliverables**

Discussion: The committee members who receive release time signed up for the following activities and deliverables:

##### Workshops

- Emma Chow – “Elements of Effective Assessment” (co-presenting with Tcherina Duncombe)
- Tcherina Duncombe – “Elements of Effective Assessment” (co-presenting with Emma Chow)
- Robin Fiedler – “What is Assessment?”
- Dr. Ana Porro – “You Want Me to Do What With This?” (co-presented with Patrick Tierney)
- Warren Smith – “Creating Effective Assignments”
- Patrick Tierney - “You Want Me to Do What With This?” (co-presented with Dr. Ana Porro)
- Melissa Stonecipher – “Rubrics”

##### Chapter Presentation from Assessing Student Learning by Linda Suskie

- Emma Chow – Chapter 10 and 11
- Tcherina Duncombe – Chapter 10 and 11
- Robin Fiedler – Chapter 1
- Dr. Ana Porro – TBD
- Warren Smith – Chapter 10
- Melissa Stonecipher – Chapter 9
- Patrick Tierney – Chapter 8

##### Newsletter Submissions

January – Patrick Tierney

February – Warren Smith

March – Melissa Stonecipher

April – Tcherina Duncombe, Emma Chow

TBD – Robin Fiedler, Dr. Ana Porro

Source: None

Action: None

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Submitted by:

