

General Education Committee Minutes
March 10, 2016 Minutes

Began 12:30 p.m.

Adjourned 1:20 p.m.

Present: Dr. Jeff Anderson, Michael Boyle, Ernest Gobert, Jon Inglett, Haifeng Ji, Darby Johnsen, Catherine Kinyon, Dr. Janet Perry, Dr. Max Simmons, Mary Turner, Dana Tuley-Williams, Dr. Kathy Wheat, and Dr. Courtney Vahlberg

Absent: Michael Machiorlatti, Dr. Glenne' Whisenhunt, Greg Gardner

The first item of business was a review of the minutes from the February meeting. Max made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Darby seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Next, there was a brief discussion of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) visit that took place March 8-9. The stance of the members who attended the site visit was that the Commission did not understand the General Education assessments or process. The Commission's stance was that the committee has been using a sample of convenience and that the college should require compliance of all faculty and that a syllabus inventory of all classes taught could match course objectives to outcomes. There was a brief discussion about whether syllabi from courses not taught in the outcome discipline could be examined to find matches between assignments or objectives and specific outcomes.

The committee quickly moved to a discussion of the revised writing rubric that Jon and Darby had worked on. The new rubric forces a pass/no pass dichotomy for writing samples and no longer allows a sample to pass via averaging. The rubric still consists of four categories, and a sample must receive a score of at least one (1) in all four categories. It was stated that the English and Humanities faculty approved of the revisions to the rubric. Some wording changes were proposed to make each category read consistently (see attached writing rubric and tally sheet). Jeff made a motion to accept the new writing rubric with the proposed revisions. Max seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously. The committee thanked Jon and Darby for their work.

There was a brief discussion of how to assess a group artifact. The agreement was that a group artifact should be evaluated as a whole and that the subsequent rating of competent (or not competent) be assigned to the student(s) in the group who qualified for Gen Ed assessment. In other words, we should not try to separate out individual performance in a group artifact.

Max asked if the college offered any performance-based general education courses. The college does not. He suggested that students in those courses bring the skills and knowledge that they acquire in general education courses into performance courses with them. The committee agreed that faculty who teach performance-based courses should be encouraged to contribute artifacts for assessment.

Courtney mentioned again that there was an inquiry about including artifacts from Spanish language classes. Assessments of those artifacts would require a translator. Michael said that he would speak with Dr. Ginnett Rollins about what kind of artifacts she was proposing to the committee.

Time was running short, so other items were tabled for a later meeting. The committee adjourned.

OCCC Outcomes Assessment Rubric for Writing

A score of 1 or better denotes competence in that area.

To pass, an artifact must receive a 1 or better in all four categories listed below.

CATEGORY	2	1	0
Thesis or main idea	The thesis or main idea is arguable, clearly stated, and may offer some original and thoughtful insight about the work under discussion.	The thesis or main idea is arguable and clearly stated.	The thesis or main idea is either weakly written or not expressed at all.
Evidence/examples	Well-reasoned arguments are supported by specific, concrete, and appropriate details.	Some details exist to support the thesis or main idea, but they may not always be relevant. Arguments are logical.	At best, evidence sometimes supports the thesis or main idea, but the supporting detail is weak or not relevant.
Paragraph development	Paragraph(s) are organized in a pattern appropriate to the thesis or main idea. The organization must in all cases be clear, logical, and apparent to the reader.	Paragraph(s) are organized in a pattern that is for the most part clear to the reader and appropriate to the thesis or main idea.	At best, paragraph(s) show an attempt at organization, and they are sometimes appropriate to the thesis or main idea.
Spelling, grammar, and usage	The assignment is written completely in standard English. It contains no significant errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, or usage that obscure the writer's meaning or dominate the reader's perception of the assignment.	The assignment is written primarily in standard English. It may contain errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, or usage, but these errors do not significantly obscure the writer's meaning or dominate the reader's perception of the assignment.	The English used and/or errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, or usage serve to make it very difficult to discern the writer's meaning and/or dominate the reader's perception of the assignment.

OCCC Rubric for Written Communication Competency – Tally Sheet

Writing Outcome: The student will demonstrate effective writing skills.

Please rate each category with a score of 0-2. While scoring the artifact, please identify significant errors in the comments sections.

Objective	2	1	0
Generate a clear, specific, and arguable thesis or main idea. Comments:			
Formulate evidence and examples to support the topic idea. Comments:			
Construct a logical pattern of paragraph development. Comments:			
Demonstrate consistent use of correct and appropriate spelling, grammar, and usage. Comments:			

____ Pass – score of 1 or higher in all four categories.

____ No pass – score below 1 in any category.