

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
March 13, 2014 Minutes

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

Present: Dr. Courtney Vahlberg, Mary Turner, Anita Williams, Dr. Max Simmons, Ernest Gobert, Brent Noel, Julie Rice-Rollins, Dr. Kathy Wheat, Jay Ramanjulu, and Pam Stout

Absent: Catherine Kinyon, Greg Gardner, Doug Gregory, and Dr. Glenne' Whisenhunt

The first item of business was reading and accepting the minutes from the February meeting. Brent made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Pam seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The next item addressed was one begun in the February meeting, the changing of the critical thinking rubric to from the AACU Critical Thinking Values Rubric, which the Critical Thinking (non-science) team found very cumbersome to apply, to the Facione and Facione rubric (see attached). The concern voiced in the February meeting was that our definition of critical thinking be consistent with the parameters treated by the proposed rubric. After comparison of the working definition of critical thinking shown by entry 4 of the Facione and Facione scoring rubric with the OCCC Critical Thinking outcome (the definition and subcomponents), the committee agreed that there was no disparity between the Facione definition and ours. Courtney made a motion that the teams assessing critical thinking use the Facione and Facione rubric starting this summer. Max seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The bulk of the discussion in the March meeting focused on the combination of two of the current outcomes into one, a topic which also was begun in the February meeting. Social Institutions and Human Heritage, Culture, Values, and Beliefs overlap in several areas, and Social Institutions has never received many artifacts. The hope is that, by combining the two outcomes into one, more artifacts will be contributed and a more solid assessment of OCCC students' knowledge of these areas can be made.

The final product was:

Human Heritage, Culture, and Institutions

Outcome

Demonstrate an understanding of the ideas, values, and beliefs that shape global communities and the function of major social institutions in them.

Subcomponents

- Demonstrate an understanding of major cultural issues, events and figures, and ethical concerns of selected global communities in historic and geographic context.
- Analyze how political and/or economic systems impact a society.
- Analyze how religion serves to shape the norms of a society.

- Analyze how education interacts with cultural values and norms.
- Analyze how shifts in social institutions impact the family.

Courtney made a motion to combine the Social Institutions and Human Heritage, Culture, Values, and Beliefs outcomes into one outcome, Human Heritage, Culture, and Institutions, with the description and subcomponents shown above. Max seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Courtney will send the proposed combined outcome to Dr. Aquino for his approval.

Last in the discussion was a brief report concerning the numbers of faculty who have submitted artifacts in recent semesters:

	Fulltime	Adjunct	total
Number of participating faculty			
Fall 2012	18	4	22
Spring 2013	19	6	25
Fall 2013	17	0	17
Number of artifacts			
Fall 2012	241	9	250
Spring 2013	310	24	334
Fall 2013	168	0	168

Courtney asked the committee members to mention the need for artifacts in the April division meetings. Mary showed the committee her idea to generate more contributions to Gen Ed artifacts: bookmarks with information and a chocolate (see attached) to be distributed to all full time and adjunct faculty as a reminder that artifacts are still needed and can be submitted to Courtney. The committee agreed that this was a good idea and that it should be implemented in time for the April 1 division meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 pm so that those teaching a 1:30 pm class could get there on time.



Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

Dr. Peter A. Facione
Santa Clara University

Dr. Noreen C. Facione, R.N., FNP
University of California, San Francisco

Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

Facione and Facione

4

Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.
Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions.
Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.
Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.

3

Does most or many of the following:

Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view.
Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions.
Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.
Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.

2

Does most or many of the following:

Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments.
Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions.
Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.
Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.

1

Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.
Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.
Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.
Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.
Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.
Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.

Instructions for Using the Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

1. Understand the construct.

This four level rubric treats critical thinking as a set of cognitive skills supported by certain personal dispositions. To reach a judicious, purposive judgment a good critical thinker engages in analysis, interpretation, evaluation, inference, explanation, and meta-cognitive self-regulation. The disposition to pursue fair-mindedly and open-mindedly the reasons and evidence wherever they lead is crucial to reaching sound, objective decisions and resolutions to complex, ill-structured problems. So are the other critical thinking dispositions, such as systematicity, reasoning self-confidence, cognitive maturity, analyticity, and inquisitiveness. [For details on the articulation of this concept refer to Critical Thinking: A Statement of Expert Consensus for Purposes of Educational Assessment and Instruction, ERIC Document Number: ED 315 423.]

2. Differentiate and Focus

Holistic scoring requires focus. In any essay, presentation, or clinical practice setting many elements must come together for overall success: critical thinking, content knowledge, and technical skill (craftsmanship). Deficits or strengths in any of these can draw the attention of the rater. However, in scoring for any one of the three, one must attempt to focus the evaluation on that element to the exclusion of the other two.

3. Practice, Coordinate and Reconcile.

Ideally, in a training session with other raters one will examine sample essays (videotaped presentations, etc.) which are paradigmatic of each of the four levels. Without prior knowledge of their level, raters will be asked to evaluate and assign ratings to these samples. After comparing these preliminary ratings, collaborative analysis with the other raters and the trainer is used to achieve consistency of expectations among those who will be involved in rating the actual cases. Training, practice, and inter-rater reliability are the keys to a high quality assessment.

Usually, two raters will evaluate each essay/assignment/project/performance. If they disagree there are three possible ways that resolution can be achieved: (a) by mutual conversation between the two raters, (b) by using an independent third rater, or (c) by taking the average of the two initial ratings. The averaging strategy is strongly discouraged. Discrepancies between raters of more than one level suggest that detailed conversations about the CT construct and about project expectations are in order. This rubric is a **four** level scale, half point scoring is inconsistent with its intent and conceptual structure. Further, at this point in its history, the art and science of holistic critical thinking evaluation cannot justify asserting half-level differentiations.

If working alone, or without paradigm samples, one can achieve a greater level of internal consistency by not assigning final ratings until a number of essays/projects/performances/assignments have been viewed and given preliminary ratings. Frequently natural clusters or groupings of similar quality soon come to be discernible. At that point one can be more confident in assigning a firmer critical thinking score using this four level rubric. After assigning preliminary ratings, a review of the entire set assures greater internal consistency and fairness in the final ratings.



**Be Sweet
Donate a
General Education
Artifact**

**See the Outcomes and
Rubrics at**



**Contact
Courtney Vahlberg
cvahlberg@occc.edu**