

MEETING Minutes
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, February 22, 2013
10:00 p.m. – 12:00 noon
CPB 201, Lake Worth

Attendance:	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input type="checkbox"/>
Robin Fiedler <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robin Hoggins-Blake <input type="checkbox"/>	David Knopp <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marcie Pachter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input type="checkbox"/>
David Pena <input type="checkbox"/>	Ana Porro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Helen Shub, Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Debra-Anne Singleton <input 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"/>	

ITEM 1. SLC/Writing Faculty Meeting Update

Discussion: The committee reviewed the results of the meeting that took place on February 15th between the SLC managers, writing specialists and composition faculty.

Although the intent of the meeting was to describe the current processes and procedures, it became clear very quickly that these vary from campus to campus, both within the SLCs as well as among the faculty. One common issue that was brought up is that the role of the SLC must be communicated consistently. It was noted that the student often becomes the “middle man” in this process which creates confusion. It is a common occurrence for a student to misrepresent instructions given by a faculty member when the student comes into the lab for help with an assignment. Similarly, when a tutor or learning specialist helps a student, information from that session may be misrepresented by the student when discussing the matter with faculty. It was agreed that both the faculty and the SLC should understand that these situations will continue to occur to some degree, but that it can be mitigated by creating and promoting a consistent message regarding the function of the SLC.

Towards that end, it was suggested that representatives from all four SLCs meet and outline a clear message regarding the role of the SLC. The group will reconvene in a month to review the material. Once the message is finalized, it will be put on the SLCs website and will serve as a central location for students and faculty to receive information about the SLC.

Some of the specific suggestions for this clarifying message include:

1. Faculty should convey to students that in order to benefit from the help offered by the SLC, the student must make multiple visits to the SLC for each writing assignment. It was noted that there are several steps to a tutor helping a student improve a paper which require the student to do work on his or her own and then return to the SLC for a follow up. What frequently happens is that students come in one time – often very briefly – and then tell their professor that the SLC helped them with their writing assignment. This conveys the wrong message, because without the multiple visits, the writing has typically not been improved, yet the student is suggesting that the SLC has already approved of the particular paper.
2. Create videos featuring students to add to the SLC website. The content of these videos will support the consistent message for both students and faculty.
3. Put bios of all the tutors on the website, along with their pictures. This will assist in both faculty and students becoming familiar with the tutors and their specialties and will make recommendations easier. It is also believed that this can help foster relationships between tutors and faculty as well as between tutors and students.
4. Faculty could be encouraged to include a link in their Blackboard courses to the SLC website, reinforcing the consistency of the message students receive as to what to expect from a visit to the SLC.
5. An open house/social event can be planned to allow additional interaction between the SLC staff and the faculty.

Additional items that were brought up include the following:

1. A question was raised about the process for follow up when faculty utilize SCORE – the early alert system. Helen Shub will contact Student Services to clarify what the process is on each campus.
2. Ms. Shub mentioned the Gordon Rule survey that was recently sent out to faculty. She was asked to send the draft policy to those in the group who did not receive the survey.

It was agreed that another meeting should be scheduled in one month's time. At that meeting, the SLC managers will present information on the functions of the SLC. The purpose will be to use this information to craft the wording and presentation for the SLC website.

Data source: None

Action: Ms. Shub will contact Student Services to clarify the follow-up procedure when faculty utilize the SCORE system. Ms. Shub will also schedule a follow-up meeting for the SLC managers, writing specialists and composition faculty.

ITEM 2. Gordon Rule Policy Survey Results

Discussion: The committee reviewed the results of the survey sent to faculty for their comments on the proposed policy statement for Gordon Rule courses. Based on the suggestions from the survey, the committee made numerous revisions to the statement. Ms. Shub will

revise the policy statement and send it out to the committee for their final review prior to sending it to the Academic Deans' Council for approval.

Data source: Qualtrix survey results for Gordon Rule Policy Statement

Action: Ms. Shub will revise the statement and send it to the committee.

ITEM 3. Campus Forums

Discussion: Ms. Shub distributed to the committee the compiled results of the campus forums. The committee agreed that at the next meeting, everyone will come prepared with two examples of possible wording for each general education learning outcome.

Data source: Campus forum results

Action: None

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 am.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe