

**MEETING Minutes**  
**General Education Assessment Committee**  
**Friday, December 7, 2012**  
**10:00 p.m. – 12:00 noon**  
**CPB 202, Lake Worth**

---



---

<b>Attendance:</b>	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Robin Fiedler <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robin Hoggins-Blake <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Knopp <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marcie Pachter <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: Daniel McGavin

**ITEM 1. General Education/AA Degree Assessment Results**

**Discussion:** The committee reviewed a variety of charts and tables displaying the results of the general education and Associate of Arts degree assessments. The discussion about the general education results supported the committee’s decision from last year to focus on the communications learning outcome as a multi-year endeavor. Both communications and critical thinking (which is being addressed through the QEP) showed results that were lower than or as low as the other outcomes. Information literacy was actually at the same level as communications and it is expected that aspects of information literacy will be included in the plan to improve students’ writing skills.

The committee discussed some of the difficulties encountered in the scoring of the scenarios and determined that during the spring semester, the scenarios and rubrics will be revised. The emphasis of the revisions will be twofold: 1) Since some of the scenarios have been used for three assessment cycles, the committee felt that it is time to change them to avoid the possibility of students becoming familiar with the testing items; and 2) The rubrics will be re-examined to make sure they properly align with the details and questions posed by the scenarios.

The committee considered ideas for how to increase student engagement in the assessment process. They acknowledged that the difficulty with low stakes testing, i.e., not tied to a student’s grade, is that students may not put forth effort. This causes the College’s results to inadequately reflect the competency level that the students have actually attained. Suggestions that were made include trying to get funding for incentives, such as an iPad for a raffle for the high scorers and the creating of a video for faculty to help them understand their role in increasing student engagement.

A suggestion was made to present the results in a different format – rather than just giving the average scores for each of the scenarios, to additionally provide the faculty with the percent of students who scored a “4” or “5” on each scenario. In this way, it will provide faculty with another goal – not just to increase the average score, but to increase the percent of high scorers as well.

The results for the Associate of Arts degree were also reviewed (the institutional measures) and it was determined that it was appropriate to continue targeting the same two measures identified in the previous cycle: Specifically, 1) The percent of students enrolled in developmental writing courses who achieve a grade of “C” or better in the developmental course; and, 2) The percent of students who earn a grade of “C” or better in their first college-level writing course who completed reading and/or writing developmental courses in the prior year.

A discussion took place about adding learning outcomes for the Associate of Arts degree beyond the general education learning outcomes. It was decided that Ms. Shub will inquire at the upcoming SACS meeting what other institutions are doing.

The committee reaffirmed that the purpose of assessment is to utilize the results to make improvements. Ms. Shub reminded them that the process is for the committee to recommend improvement strategies. Those recommendations will be presented to the Academic Deans’ Council in January for their review and suggestions. Subsequent to that, in February, the strategies will be presented to the Executive Leadership Council for their review and revisions. The Executive Leadership Council will provide the final approval for the improvement strategies.

Once the improvement strategies are finalized, they will be shared with the faculty along with the assessment results prior to Development Day in March when the clusters meet. Ms. Shub will prepare a report that presents the results with explanations for the faculty.

Based on the assessment results, the committee determined that the following improvement strategies related to the Communications outcome will be developed and implemented in the upcoming year:

1. Gordon Rule Policy – a survey will be sent to all full-time faculty allowing them to comment on the draft policy developed by the General Education Assessment Committee. The faculty input will be reviewed and revisions will be made to the policy as needed. Once revised and approved, the policy will be put into affect for the fall 2012 term.
2. A series of videos will be developed, similar to “Rotten Riting”. The purpose of these videos will be to help faculty who do not teach composition to be able to incorporate grading writing into their curriculum. In addition, the videos will be designed to help faculty understand the importance of the assessment process and what their role is. This will be a multi-year project.
3. Professor Daniel McGavin will be holding a workshop for faculty who teach Gordon Rule classes. The intent of this workshop is to assist non-composition faculty to incorporate writing expectations into their curriculum. Participants will review their current assignments to ensure that they have measurable outcomes, concrete

directions and a rubric in order to be able to hold students accountable for the quality of their writing.

4. Common Learning Outcomes and Rubric for the College Writing Program – this process began last year and is being continued. Common learning outcomes and a rubric were developed for all three composition classes – EAP 1684, ENC 0025 and ENC 1101 – and incorporated into the syllabus and curriculum for each course. In this coming year, tools will be developed to assist faculty in developing the skills to effectively utilize the rubric.
5. Revision of Scenarios and Rubrics – The committee will revise the scenarios so that they align with their respective rubric to allow for analytic grading.
6. Information Literacy Module – This module was developed as a result of the findings of a prior assessment cycle. It is the intent of the committee to pilot this module in several ENC 1101 classes.
7. Student Learning Center/Faculty Communication – A subcommittee will explore the concerns of faculty and SLC staff and assist in the development of processes and procedures to enhance the relationship between what is learned in the classroom and how support is provided in the lab.
8. Linked Courses – Sections of ENC1102 and SPC1017 will be linked to combine research and presentation skills. The common theme is how technology, specifically the Internet, affects critical thinking, reading, writing and oral communication processes.
9. Academic Development Day – Dr. Mark Taylor will spend half a day with faculty on March 19, 2013, providing them with hands-on methods for “flipping”, i.e., reducing time spent teaching content in the classroom (students learn the material outside of class time) to allow for more engagement and higher level learning to occur inside the classroom.
10. Planning for Academic Success – Dr Mark Taylor will spend the morning with students on January 25, 2013 discussing strategies for enhanced learning.
11. Safe Assign – the College will be piloting the use of the Blackboard products Safe Assign in a number of classes during the spring and summer terms and rolling it out to the entire College in the fall. Because this product is easier to use than Turnitin.com, it is anticipated that faculty use will increase.
12. Embedded Assessment – The results from the pilot administered in a random sample of Gordon Rule classes will be scored during the spring semester. It is anticipated that a simplified rubric will be developed as a result of this process. The faculty of the non-composition classes will be encouraged to use this rubric to grade their students’ writing. A detailed plan for the integration of writing into non-composition classes will be developed during the spring 2013 semester.

Based on the assessment results, the committee determined that the following ongoing improvement strategies are related to the Associate of Arts Degree:

1. Common Learning Outcomes and Rubric for the College Writing Program – as described above, this effort is designed to create a seamless progression for students from prep English to credit English.
2. The College has undertaken a five-year strategic plan that involves the revision of policies and grading practices as well as curriculum changes, specifically to enhance student learning and subsequent success in credit classes.

Data source: General Education Assessment results (Compliance Assist template, Charts of ETS Proficiency Profile, Scenarios and California Critical Thinking Skills Test results, Correlations)

Associate of Arts Degree results (Compliance Assist Template)

Action: Ms. Shub will gather information at the SACS meeting about how similar institutions are measuring their AA degrees. In addition, she will calculate the scenario results to see what percentage of students scored a "4" or "5" on each scenario and prepare all the results for dissemination to the faculty.

## **ITEM 2. Development Day Survey Results**

Discussion: Ms. Shub distributed to the committee the results of the Academic Development Day Survey. Based on the survey results, the committee made recommendations for sessions that should be repeated at future development days. In addition, they discussed the format for the spring 2013 Development Day when Dr. Mark Taylor will be the featured presenter.

Data source: Academic Development Day Survey

Action: **None**

## **ITEM 3. Spring Schedule**

Discussion: Tabled until next meeting

Data source: None

Action: **None**

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 am.

Submitted by:

---

Helen Shub, Scribe