

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**April 11, 2019 Minutes**

Meeting Began: 12:38 p.m.  
Meeting Adjourned: 1:25 p.m.

Present: Ernest Gobert, John Helton, Max Simmons, Stacie Warner, Michael Boyle, Makenna Green, Steve Shore, Johnny Hill, Charles Myrick, Janet Perry, Julie Rice-Rollins

Absent: Jennifer Brumley, Mary Turner, Shanna Padgham, Teresa Luper, Kim Jameson, Glenne' Whisenhunt

The committee reviewed the minutes from the March meeting. Michael made a motion to accept the minutes, and Stacie seconded the motion. The minutes were accepted with unanimous approval. Ernest discussed the evaluation team members for General Education artifacts. Most who were invited accepted. Ernest is waiting on recommendations from Dean Harrison for Human Heritage, Culture, and Institutions to replace Michael Snyder and Public Speaking to replace Gwin Faulconer-Lippert. Julie Corff forwarded a name for a full-time professor for Public Speaking, so filling up the Public Speaking group should happen soon. Several on the General Education Committee serve on assessment teams. Ernest will be sending names to Academic Affairs to set up the stipends; the first payments should be in June. Ernest has set up the norming session for the two writing teams for Tuesday morning, the Tuesday when grades are due. Everyone accepted the invitation. It will take about half an hour. He usually pulls two writing artifacts to rate: one technical writing sample and one essay-style writing sample. The teams usually give roughly the same assessment, and people requested to stay on the same teams this year.

The way the committee invites people to serve on teams will change next year to expose more faculty to the process. Michael suggested an elaboration of the norming process for next year with written expectations of rubric scoring to get consistent results. Max mentioned that rotations on the assessment teams should occur slowly, keeping most of the team members the same. Ernest expressed that perhaps the teams could rotate not more than one out of three team members to help the people who are new to the process since assessment is different from grading. Ernest said that he would mention the one-of-three rotation proposal to Academic Affairs. On the Mathematical Methods team, Sara Mathew has replaced Michael Machiorlatti. Her participation will be helpful since IT will be contributing computer programming artifacts this year.

Ernest mentioned going to several assessment sessions at the Higher Learning Commission's Annual Conference during April 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup>. He encouraged the committee to begin thinking about answers that will be needed for the Higher Learning Commission's site visit in 2021. While faculty submit a quantity of artifacts, Ernest mentioned the need for diversity of artifacts and consistency. Each year, submissions include around the same number of artifacts but not the same kinds of artifacts. The submissions often come from completely different courses from year to year. The committee does not consistently get the same artifacts. Ernest discussed the need to chart improvement and results, but that is hard to do when the submissions vary so much from year to year. As an example, Ernest brought up how math Gen Ed courses created uniform questions for assessment. The committee needs to get artifacts from these courses and see how

students are doing on the questions. Also, Biology, Chemistry, and HP courses provide some mathematical artifacts. By comparing the same artifacts from the same courses, the assessment teams could look to see what changes occur. Ernest mentioned that Biology often submits the same chart assignment as an artifact, which gives good insight into how students respond each year. One year, a physics problem stumped students and provided a good opportunity to reflect on why the students did not do well. By looking at this information and being more consistent with artifacts, perhaps comparison could yield helpful information about how students are doing.

The committee discussed the possibility of program directors/department chairs/course coordinators turning in artifacts for at least one section of each course. Ernest mentioned that he learned from HLC that it is not so much about how we do assessment, but about what we do with the results gained from the assessment we do. Ernest posed the questions: How do we find something that needs to be improved? What are we going to do about it? Why are we doing it? What are the results saying? Are we looking to change? What are we collecting, and how are we utilizing the results? We need to find out what improvements can be made. For instance, past assessment results showed a need to work on critical thinking and drawing out logical conclusions. While results are needed for HLC, the results should be used for actually improving. Ernest said that assessment is not about faculty-level assessment or assessing teaching. It is about assessing the whole institution and making improvements for students.

Max discussed the need to communicate intent and close the loop. He suggested looking at specific areas and letting faculty know about specific courses from which the committee is wanting to receive artifacts. Michael discussed looking at specific courses and letting faculty know what courses the committee would like to look at from year to year to try to get a consistent result. Committee discussed need to make the intent clear on the front end. Ernest mentioned the possibility of a Center for Learning and Teaching session on submitting artifacts and General Education in the fall. He encouraged the committee to think about how OCCC does something with the results of assessment.

Stacie suggested having an informative session for new faculty so that more people will understand what General Education assessment is and how they can participate. Ernest said that he would reach out to the new faculty. Stacie also mentioned the need to inform adjunct faculty more about the process. Max discussed a possible structure for looking at specific concerns, asking for artifacts from certain courses, and then gathering responses from faculty that respond to the concerns and results. John mentioned that it would be helpful for faculty to have this kind of information regarding concerns and responses for which the committee is looking before writing new syllabi for courses. Janet encouraged the committee to think about inculcating the idea of improvement into everyday lives and looking at assessment as a way to reflect on what we do to make students successful.

Ernest encouraged faculty to remind their divisions about submitting artifacts at the division meetings in May and thanked the committee for their work.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.