

**General Education Committee Minutes
November 12, 2015**

Began 12:30 p.m.

Adjourned 1:20 p.m.

Present: Michael Boyle, Ernest Gobert, Jon Inglett, Haifeng Ji, Darby Johnsen, Michael Machiorlatti, Dr. Janet Perry, Dana Tuley-Williams, Mary Turner, and Dr. Courtney Vahlberg

Absent: Dr. Jeff Anderson, Greg Gardner, Catherine Kinyon, Dr. Max Simmons, and Dr. Kathy Wheat

Courtney first introduced Dana Tuley-Williams to the committee. Dana replaced Jay Ramanjulu as the library representative after Jay retired this semester. Next, everyone read the minutes from the October meeting. Jon made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Michael Boyle seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

The November meeting was focused on the rubrics for the math and writing outcomes. Math was addressed first. The old rubric consisted of a 5-point (five level) scale for each category. The new rubric, which was revised in the spring of 2015 and approved by a unanimous vote, has just two levels: competent and not competent. Students must show competence in all three categories to meet the standard.

It was noted that the math artifacts have been coming from a very small selection of courses and also are not large in number. It was also noted that public speaking artifacts also came from a very small selection of courses. The plan of action discussed was to solicit artifacts from a wider variety of OCCC courses. It was suggested that Prep and Planning Week be used for this purpose, as virtually all of the full-time OCCC faculty would be there.

Michael Machiorlatti asked whether there can be examples posted of what would constitute competent versus not competent artifact to help establish consistency over time. It is possible to pull examples from previous artifacts. During this discussion, it was suggested that this information should be housed in SharePoint, but not on the web site. Janet suggested that the committee draw the faculty's attention to the examples in case they decide to submit artifacts.

Jon asked if there is a way to break down the categories in the rubrics in which students lack competence. The committee discussed this and agreed that it would be helpful to know specifically where students were showing weaknesses so that these could be addressed. Courtney agreed to look into how this might be done.

Finally, committee members turned their attention to the writing rubric. Writing results were troubling this year because almost every artifact met the competency standard. Artifacts had to have an *average* score of 1 on the rubric to pass, so, in some cases, students could be lacking competence in one category but still be assessed as competent overall. The committee discussed changing this so that an artifact must have at least a score of 1 in all four categories on the rubric in order to pass. After much discussion, it was decided that all categories of the rubric were not equally important. Jon and Darby were tasked with rewriting the rubric and presenting it at the February, 2016, meeting. As with math, the committee agreed that tracking specific areas of weakness in writing would be helpful, and that examples of competent versus not competent could aid with consistency over time.

At that time, the committee adjourned.