

## **General Education Meeting September 10, 2015 Minutes**

Began: 12:30 p.m.  
Adjourned: 1:20 p.m.

Present: Dr. Jeff Anderson, Michael Boyle, Ernest Gobert, Jon Inglett, Haifeng Ji, Darby Johnson, Catherine Kinyon, Michael Machiorlatti, Dr. Janet Perry, Jay Ramanjulu, Dr. Max Simmons, Mary Turner, Dr. Courtney Vahlberg, and Dr. Kathy Wheat

Absent: Dr. Glenne' Whisenhunt and Greg Gardner

The first item of business was to introduce the members of the committee and give a brief overview of what the General Education Committee does. The members then read the minutes from the April, 2015, meeting. Darby made a motion to approve the minutes. Max seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

Courtney introduced the committee charter and its purpose. Since most general education courses are in place, she explained that the focus of the committee is now on assessment. She explained that there are ten voting members on the committee: eight faculty representing each academic division, Max, and Darby. At least half of the voting members have to be present for there to be a quorum.

Next, Courtney mentioned that the October meeting would be located in the CBS/MEPS division office due to a conflict with OACC. She also showed the new members the website that has the General Education Committee information: OCCC home; Academic Affairs; Institutional Committees; General Education. From there, faculty will find links for General Education Documents, General Education Courses, General Education Assessment, Outcomes and Rubrics, Resources for Students, and General Education Committee Minutes. Darby mentioned that Catherine has created a Prezi to explain General Education.

The discussion next turned to the FY2015 assessment results. Courtney distributed a grid showing five-year results. The goal for each assessment area is for a minimum of 70% of the artifacts to be evaluated as competent or better based on the rubric for that outcome. Courtney explained that the outcome for Human Heritage, Culture, and Institutions was created by combining the two previous outcomes of Human Heritage, Culture, Values, and Beliefs and Social Institutions. The Critical Thinking outcome began with a science only emphasis (Science Methodology) and has since become all inclusive.

An ongoing issue is faculty participation in the assessment. Some nonparticipation comes from the belief that the artifacts will be used to assess faculty performance. The committee consistently struggles to persuade faculty to understand that the outcomes are now written in such a way that the institution owns responsibility for them and not specific departments. Appropriate artifacts can come from almost any class across the curriculum and not just those that historically have been associated with the outcome. Students, for example, may demonstrate

mathematical reasoning skills in economics or psychology or computer science and not just in a math or physical science course.

There is still resistance on the part of many faculty to submit artifacts even though the outcomes will not personally impact them or their students. Artifacts are assessed during the summer by teams who use the appropriate General Education rubric for the outcome they assess. Identifying information is removed from the artifacts and results are reported in aggregate by outcome. Some faculty do not submit artifacts because they believe they have to create special assignments that fit the outcome. The committee requests artifacts based on assignments or even test questions that the faculty currently use.

One committee member suggested that some faculty are reluctant to submit artifacts because they fear having comparisons drawn between instructors. Max responded by saying that the Dean's Council doesn't view the results of the assessments as belonging to individual faculty or departments. He stressed that the emphasis is on the skills that students demonstrate when completing their assignments. It was suggested that the committee report the results to the faculty instead of Academic Affairs. The committee agreed that there are perception issues and that those will continue to be addressed.

Max asked Janet what she believed the HLC opinion is of our assessments and outcomes. She responded that they are happy that OCCC has a process in place. Under the new accreditation process, the college must submit a goal for improvement and document that process.

Courtney mentioned that one outcome for faculty who submit artifacts is that they tend to become more mindful of their teaching.

Max stated that the leadership at OCCC is happy with the General Education process. They like the idea that the committee is working to take the assessment process up to another level.

A committee member suggested that each assessment group should come up with three examples of good artifacts for that outcome to share with faculty and encourage participation. Those are things that are already housed on the General Education website.

Lastly, it was suggested that all labeling be changed to include "Across the Divisions."

The meeting adjourned.