

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
October 10, 2019 Minutes

Meeting Began: 12:41 p.m.
Meeting Adjourned: 1:22 p.m.

Present: Ernest Gobert, Max Simmons, Makenna Green Garrison, Johnny Hill, Glenne' Whisenhunt, Chris Shelley, Gyanendra Baral, Ivana Pavic, Leslie Jones, Stephen Morrow, Michael Boyle, Ron Feller, Liz Miller

Absent: Teresa Luper, Steve Shore, Janet Perry, Julie Rice-Rollins, Kim Jameson, Tamala Zolicoffer

The committee reviewed the minutes from the September meeting. Leslie made a motion to accept the minutes, and Stephen seconded the motion. The minutes were accepted with unanimous approval.

Ernest invited those who served on the Critical Thinking evaluation team in the summer to reflect on the submissions for Critical Thinking.

Stephen Morrow shared that students struggle to pose questions and may need analysis skills to do the critical thinking. He suggested that sometimes there is too much guidance on how to do the assignment but not enough time spent on the analysis to get there. There is room to practice that skill of doing the analysis needed to pose a question, not just the answer.

Max Simmons discussed that there are very different types of artifacts and that it is hard to get uniformity across all of the science courses. Some of the questions just ask for the answer. Students are not asked to support the answer. Ivana mentioned that, even when the thinking is logical and critical, students can arrive at right answers for the wrong reasons. Assignments with graphs are helpful for evaluation when students have to explain why. It is helpful when there is consistency with the questions.

Regarding the artifacts themselves, Stephen suggested that there is room for improvement with helping students develop analysis skills and the ability to create a thesis.

Chris Shelley asked for clarification on the goals of General Education. Makenna and Ernest shared some history about General Education assessment. Liz asked about participation in artifact submissions. Makenna and Ernest discussed the need for participation in artifacts across campus for more helpful results. Makenna discussed the need to evaluate the Critical Thinking rubric and see if it is still meeting the needs of OCCC.

Michael and Glenne' asked about changes with the rubric and asked questions about the data and results if the rubrics are changed. Michael asked if the Critical Thinking rubric is allowing evaluators flexibility in reviewing artifacts.

Makenna displayed the Critical Thinking rubric and asked the committee to get into groups and look at the rubric.

Leslie mentioned that her group looked at the language and the categories on the rubric and proposed some changes in language and scoring. Michael asked for clarifications on how the group's proposed changes would affect the scoring (for instance, what the scale would be: 0, 1, 2, etc.).

Glenné mentioned some rubrics online that might more clearly define what the evaluators are looking for in Critical Thinking.

Makenna provided the assignment for the next committee meeting. Each division representative is to meet with the other representative and the division and bring back comments and reflections on the Critical Thinking rubric to the meeting in November.

The meeting adjourned at 1:22 p.m.