Minutes: The General Education Assessment Council Meeting

Friday, July 22, 2005

Room L-108, 9:00am-11:30am

Members: Frank Carter, Humanities/Fine Arts Chair; Robert Puckett, Social Science Chair; Jill Lahnstein, Chair of English; Pat Hogan, Interim Chair of Business; Ken Hufham, Math/Science/PE Chair; Subi Rajendra, Learning Lab Coordinator; Vivian Boykin, Director of Counseling; Patrick Pittman, Director of Career and Testing Services (not present); Orangel Daniels, Dean of Arts and Sciences and Chair of General Education Assessment Council.

Review the Council’s Mission—The General Education Assessment Council is an oversight committee for the general education assessment at CFCC. To create a more unified assessment of the general education core, the General Education Assessment Council will review the general education core competencies, goals, assessment instruments, and data annually. The membership of the Council will expand fall of 2005 to include more faculty participants.

Orangel pointed out that assessment of the general education core is the most controversial or difficult assessment on any campus. We are assessing two-year degree programs, not diploma programs, when we talk about the general education core. SACS seems favorable to institutions using rubrics, pre- and post-tests, or common finals for the assessment. Jason said that electronic portfolios are gaining popularity but are time-consuming.

Points to Remember from Dr. James Nichols’ text titled General Education Assessment for Improvement of Student Academic Achievement: Guidance for Academic Departments and Committees
(Comments within parentheses are those of a Council member and not of Dr. Nichols; quoted material is from Dr. Nichols’ text.)

1. (CFCC is on the right course by having each unit instructional manager establish 3-5 learning outcomes annually.) Outcomes are intended or expected results or statements on what graduates should be able to think, know, or do. As we develop these outcomes, we need to be aware of our students’ level of abilities when they enter the college.
2. General education does not include remedial or developmental courses or courses offered in direct support of a major, like anatomy and physiology or business math. We assess curriculum courses only, not precurriculum. (In some North Carolina SACS compliance documents, a few schools have assessed their students' reading level based on developmental courses; but such courses should not have been included).

3. There are two approaches to the assessment of the general education core: the course/departmental approach and the programmatic approach. The course approach focuses on assessing the course objectives and not on the development of the whole student. Assessment must be done by more than one faculty member teaching the course. Course-level assessment is time-consuming, but it is the approach taken at many institutions. Assessing writing and math has proven to be the easiest skills to assess at the course level.

The programmatic approach is better, but it is the “road less traveled.” There is reinforcement across the disciplines, and the focus is on the development of the whole student. This approach is difficult for many reasons: it involves collaboration among departments and faculty feel that their academic freedom is being infringed upon. With the programmatic approach, assessment is not left to one discipline or one faculty member. Students learn a skill better when it is reinforced across the curriculum. For example, there should be math and writing across all curricula. (CFCC just needs to decide how to incorporate the math skills.)

4. Institutions don’t need to assess every student, only a sample of their students.

5. Institutions don’t need to assess every course, every year. Restated, SACS does not require everything to be assessed all the time. As long as institutions can show that they have a systematic assessment procedure in place, they are fine. (CFCC has online planning!) We may identify the courses reinforcing these skills and rotate assessing the students in these courses.

6. Faculty can’t use students’ grades in the course as validation that a skill has been assessed. In Chemical Tech, for example, if means of assessment are taking place within a course or are course-embedded, the results of this assessment will need to be reviewed a second time by a panel of faculty broadly representative of those teaching in the discipline or department. Exception: Curriculum grades may be used if one is trying to assess the effectiveness of development courses. Student grades earned at a senior institution may be used if one is trying to assess the strength of the transfer program at a community college.

7. Institutions usually select two or more of the following skills to assess:
   a. Basic Skills—Reading, writing, speaking, listening, performing math calculations, and demonstrating basic computer skills. Computer skills should be defined at the liberal arts level and not at the level for Chemical Tech students or Machining students. (Gerry Shaver,
VP of Institutional Effectiveness, said that we may decide to define computer competency at the program level.

b. Critical thinking skills—(Since CFCC hasn’t had a common definition of critical thinking and doesn’t have a common rubric for this skill, critical thinking will not be included as part of the general education core for fall 2005)

c. Knowledge/Understanding—(CFCC may assess students’ understanding of course content as long as there is a rubric or common final in place.)

d. Values Development—“Within the humanities, students are often asked to navigate curricular patterns designed to communicate both a sense of historical or cultural perspective as well as the values of the culture. Other campuses blend humanities requirements with those of the social sciences.

Among the sciences, the common concept among these courses is their inclusion of the scientific method as a basis for their field.”

Dr. Nichols indicated that even though institutions attempt to define these skills, the definition is too vague for others to determine how well graduates should be able to read, write, or speak.

Other Means of Assessment

“Performance Assessment--A situation is contrived requiring the student to demonstrate a skill or value identified in general education outcomes while the student remains enrolled at the institution:

- Art work
- Writing sample
- Videotape of oral presentations—(Reponses to Case Studies

The above examples offer direct evidence of the students’ abilities or values. These examples are so time-consuming, and institutions should consider at least a limited number of performance assessment measures regarding general education.

Behavioral observation as a Means of Assessment

This takes place when the actions of students are observed or reported and these actions are linked to intended educational outcomes. The student’s actions imply a certain set of values. Examples: voting in student elections, voluntary attendance at fine arts presentations (shows appreciation of the art), participation in public service activities as alumni (represents social consciousness).

Assessment of values or beliefs
An example: a sense of commitment to cultural diversity or development of a global perspective. Another example: commitment to the democratic process. Value assessment is the highest form of assessment for an institution but the hardest one to assess. One needs to administer pre- and post-tests. Means for Assessing values or beliefs: asking respondents,”

**Review the Core Competencies**—The Assessment Council has confirmed that CFCC’s general education core competencies should include the following: reading, writing, oral communication, basic computer usage, math and science and social sciences. Jill indicated that everyone should assess reading since the English Department is administering two common finals: the common writing proficiency and the editing proficiency. Based on the current definition of reading, there is no common final in reading. Meantime, Jill will work with Patrick Pittman and her department and will try to develop a reading rubric and find an acceptable reading assignment to administer. The administering of a reading proficiency may be rotated from department to department or from course to course.

**Review Assessment Instruments and Modify Definitions**—The tasks of the Council are listed below.

- Each chair is asked to review his/her assessment instrument (rubric, common final, or other assessment method), define the core skills or general education competencies based on the criteria being measured, and submit the definitions to Orangel by Friday, August 5:

  - Jill will define writing based on the ENG 111 rubric.
  - Pat will define computer competency based on Subi’s computer proficiency; the skills embedded in CUL 125, CTC 111, and MEC 231 and 231; the standardized exam for CIS 111 and 110; and the course content for CSC 133.
  - Robert will define history, sociology, politics, and economics based on the common finals or assignments being administered.
  - Ken will develop common finals for MAT 140, 171, and 175; GEL 120; PHY 110, 151, and 251; CHM 131; BIO 110, 111, 168, and 169. If this goal is too ambitious, the development of finals in the most popular core classes would be the priority.
  - Frank raised these points: Oral communication should not be so narrowly defined to include a formal speech. In addition, when students are videotaped in speech classes, the dynamics of assessment change. An observer will see more flaws on the videotape than he/she would see in real time, and CFCC is not preparing these students for the camera. Why are students being videotaped? Frank indicated that there is much research to support his claim. He also pointed out that some volunteers who have assessed the speeches really weren’t qualified to understand the criteria.
Oral communication competency is assessed in the following courses and Frank will develop a rubric for these courses: ENG 114, COM 110, COM 120, and COM 231. ENG 114 has one speech component and is taught by the English Department. In all classes, students are presenting information to an audience. Frank also pointed out that we are not trying to prepare these students for a mastery level.

While there is disagreement about the definition of the basic oral communication competency, there is consensus among the Council members that speech faculty should have other speech faculty or have persons outside their department judging the speeches because of the subjective nature of the speech rubric.

- Each chair is asked to develop a common rubric, common final, or assessment method for the skill or general education competency he/she has been assigned; that is, if one has not been developed.
- Each chair is asked to present the skill or competency and the assessment method to faculty in the fall so that faculty will be informed about the assessment process and feel more comfortable participating in the assessment process. If necessary, chairs are asked to prepare handouts, and Orangel will coordinate the meeting and the distribution of handouts for the presentations.
- Each chair is asked to maintain assessment data and to forward that data to Orangel for placement on the CFCC website or Intranet.
- Orangel will prepare a chart, listing the skill or competency, the courses in which the skills are being assessed and the assessment methods.

To help students transfer skills from one class to another, Orangel hopes that future first-day handouts will indicate the general education competencies being assessed or reinforced in each class.

Orangel thanked all the Council members for their expertise, cooperation, and willingness to remain longer than one hour.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25am.
Minutes of the General Education Assessment Council
Date of Meeting: September 20-22, 2005
Location: Virtual Meeting

Attendees: Frank Carter, Robert Puckett, Jill Lahnstein, Pat Hogan, Ken Hufham, Subi Rajendra, Vivian Boykin, Patrick Pittman, and Orangel Daniels.

The agenda had one item.

Each Council member received a copy of the SACS Core Requirement 3.5.1 and was asked to review it. Chairs have defined the competencies, identified the courses being assessed and identified the methods of assessment. An assessment chart was sent to each member.

The respective department chairs were asked to provide the following information:

The respective chairs were asked to provide Orangel the following information for 3.5.1:

1. **Robert Puckett, Chair of Social & Behavioral Sciences**--Is "critical evaluation" going to remain as a competency? If so, faculty cannot grade their own papers, and it must be decided how the papers will be selected for grading. Will student papers from part-time faculty be included? The competency will count as what percentage of the final grade?

   **Response:** The assessment method for the “critical evaluation” competency needs to be researched further because the history and political science faculty would be required to read the term papers, articles, and book reports of students who are not their own, and the assessment would be too labor-intensive. Therefore, CFCC will recognize only six general education core competencies.

2. **Robert Puckett**--In the sociology and psychology courses, the competency will count what percentage of the final grades? How many students will be assessed? Will the students of part-time faculty be included in the assessment?

   **Response:** For the PSY 150 and SOC 210 courses, Robert stated that this assessment model has been in place for a couple of years. He proposes that the competency not be counted as part of the final grade; this has been the case with SOC 210 in the past. All students taking these courses would be given the assessment instruments. Once a base has been established, the faculty in these courses would likely refine the approach and look to see if there might be a difference between the distance learning and Huskins classes versus the traditional courses.

   Sociology is taught by full-time faculty only. About 300 students are assessed in the data collection. In 2004-05, as the sociology faculty worked to get information on Huskins and distance learning students, the number of students questioned was significantly less. Even though there were only five classes to work with, some of the pre-test information was not gathered, and instructors must repeat the process during the Spring of 2006. Since there is a good base for the face-to-face SCO 210 classes, the IE goal in part is to assess if distance education and Huskins classes perform on a different level.

   Psychology assessment is primarily conducted by full-time faculty. Their fifty-question instrument examines five areas of the discipline that they identified as core. Results are examined for performance in each of the areas, allowing them to collectively discuss teaching pedagogy changes that can be incorporated in areas that show student weaknesses. Their sample population has also ranged around two hundred PSY 150
students. The psychology faculty also are looking at just examining the performance of DL and Huskins students.

3. **Frank Carter, Humanities/Fine Arts Chair**—As requested, Frank has provided the Council a copy of the speech rubric (see attachment). He also was asked to answer the following questions:
   
   **Will the student speeches of part-time faculty be assessed?**  
   **The speeches will count what percentage of the final grade?**  
   **How will students be selected?**  
   
   The "speech" section in the original narrative of the SACS Core Requirement 3.5.1 must be revised because the population to be assessed has changed.

   **Response:** First, there needs to be a meeting of the ENG 114 and the COM 231 faculty so that all faculty understand the speech rubric that has been adopted or will have an opportunity to ask questions about the criteria.

   In COM 231-Public Speaking, at least one speech faculty will report to a speech class (not his/her own) and help evaluate the informative speeches of students who are taught by another speech instructor. Frank elaborated as follows:

   1) In COM 231, students will be selected as they normally are on speech days in classes by pre-assigned numbers and dates.

   2) Their grades are assigned by the instructor who teaches the class. Guest observers' comments and scores will have no influence in the actual "grading" of the student. The assigning of the students' grades will still be the responsibility of the instructor, not the visiting observer.

   3) Part time instructors are as likely as any other instructor to be observed. Observed sections depend on faculty members who have on-campus hours during COM 231 sections which are not their own. As a practical matter, some sections such as those in the evening may not be observed each semester unless faculty have on-campus hours from 6-9 p.m. which is not likely. If there are not enough sections observed, the chair will observe an evening section.

4. **Jill Lahnstein, Chair of English Department**—Jill was asked to describe the speech assessment process in ENG 114 and to answer the questions that were posed to Frank Carter in number 3.

   **Response:** There are about 22 students in each ENG 114 class. The ENG 114 faculty will choose three students from each class—which would put at least 30 students in the assessment study—probably more like 36-40. The IE goal for the ENG 114 oral competency is that 80 percent of the presentations in the blind grading process will receive a pass/fail grade. To pass, the student must earn a grade of “C” or better.

5. **Pat Hogan, Chair of Business Department**—Pat was asked to respond to the following questions: The computer competency will count what percentage of the final grade in the CIS 110 and CIS 111 courses? Will the competency be administered to all students who are taking CIS 111 and 110?

   **Response:** The common final is administered to all CIS 110 and CIS 111 students. Fall and Spring of 2004-05, the enrollment of two-year degree students in CIS 110 classes was 911 students; in CIS 111 classes, 550 students. Two-year degree programs include students seeking Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Associate in Fine Arts, Associate in Applied Science, and Associate in General Education degree programs. Fall and Spring of 2005-06, Pat will again assess the students in these two CIS courses.

   Ninety (90) percent of the students in both CIS classes are expected to pass. Since the test has a SAM component and an application component, it is not a matter of how many are correct, but what percentage is correct. Students must achieve a score of 76 or higher to pass the test with a grade of “C.” However, if students earn a score of 68 or
higher and have the scores on the remaining 80 percent of the graded items to achieve a 76 overall average, they will still pass the course. The SAM test counts 20 percent of the final grade.

6. **Ken Hufham, Chair of Math/Science/PE**—Ken was asked to provide the number of students to be included in his assessment, to indicate if he will assess the sections taught by full- and part-time faculty, and to indicate what percentage of the final grades the competencies will count.

**Response:** Ken indicated that he and his faculty will assess all on-campus sections of the courses below in the 2005-06 Fall and Spring semesters. The sections are taught by both full-time and part-time instructors. These common finals will count between 10 – 25 percent of the final grades.

**Courses Assessed for the “Problem Solving” Competency:**
- PHY 110 - 4 SECTIONS - 75 students
- MAT 121 - 7 SECTIONS - 90 students
- MAT 171 - 7 SECTIONS - 196 students

**Courses Assessed for the Competency “Understanding Scientific Concepts and Applications”**
- BIO 111 - 7 SECTIONS - 168 students
- BIO 168 - 12 SECTIONS - 90 students
- BIO 169 - - 390 students
- CHM 131 - 6 SECTIONS - 144 students
- GEL 120 - 8 SECTIONS - 240 students

A common final also will be administered in MAT 070. For the general education assessment, however, MAT 070 results cannot be used in the SACS report but in an IE for the Math/Science/PE Department. Only CHM 151 and BIO 169 will be included.

A total of 1,093 students are being assessed in Ken’s department for Fall 2005 general education assessment. He and his departmental secretary will grade the objective tests, which will be scanned.

Assessment should occur fall and spring semesters for everyone so that the data may be included in the SACS report. Reminder: According to SACS, 30 percent of the general education program completers should be tested. If we choose less than 30 percent, we should be able to justify the reason. For example, if I were assessing student portfolios, I might not evaluate 30 percent because portfolios are so laborious.

Jill has done some work on the reading competency, but it will be addressed later.

All Council members were asked to review Core Requirement 3.5.1 for corrections, additions, questions, or input and submit input by. Ask yourself this question: If you were a member of the SACS visiting team, what information would you expect to see as evidence that CFCC is assessing these competencies.

Orangel asked for the responses to the questions and other input by 5pm on Wednesday, September 21, so that she would be able to do follow-ups on Friday, September 23.

Thank you.

C: General Education Assessment Council
Minutes: General Education Assessment
Council Friday, October 7, 2005 1pm-2pm,
Room 107

Present: Jason McCoy, Christian Beer, Robert Puckett, Jill Lahnstein, Frank Carter, Patrick Pittman, Subi Rajendra, Pat Hogan, Larolyn Zylicz, Jason Chaffin, Ken Hufham and Orangel Daniels.

Orangel welcomed the newest members of the Council: Jason McCoy, Psychology Instructor; Christian Beer, Economics Instructor; Larolyn Zylicz, Distance Learning Chair; Payton Andrews, Sociology Instructor (could not attend); Tom Massey, History Instructor (in class); and Grey Arey, Political Science Instructor (could not attend).

To complete the SACS section on assessing general education competencies, Orangel asked the assessors to respond to the following concerns of the CFCC SACS Leadership team:

a. Rationale for the percentages used in the assessment of general education competencies since some competencies expect a minimum of 70 percent up to a maximum of 90 percent of the students to pass the common final or assessment—
b. Explanation/clarification of the sampling process—How were the students selected? Were students in all sections assessed? What criteria were used for the random sampling? Were Huskins and distance learning students included?
c. Enrollment figures for students in the CIS 110 and 111 classes—Orangel has received these figures from Barbara Brown. When requesting information about these classes, one must remember to request the number of degree-seeking students in these classes because general education assessment focuses on two-year degree students.
d. Rationale for the assessment results counting or not counting a portion of a student's final grade

Response from Jason McCoy, Psychology Instructor and Lead Assessor for the psychology assessment (“Social Structure” competency): The psychology competency is a comprehensive or cumulative exam and represents a broad view of psychology. To count this assessment as part of the final grade may influence the faculty to teach to the test; the psychology faculty also thought that it was unfair to have this assessment count as part of a student’s final grade. There are 15 sections of psychology classes taught by full-time faculty; 10 classes (300 students) were administered this final; 125 students were actually assessed.
Seventy-six percent of the students in traditional are expected to answer at least 35 (equivalent to a grade of “C”) of the 50 multiple-choice items correctly. This test was created by all full-time psychology faculty at CFCC. In addition, CFCC has no exam week where students might have more time to prepare for their finals and would feel less pressured. Jason will include the Huskies and the distance learning students and the students taught by part-time faculty in the assessment in the Spring of 2006; he also said that the percentage of students expected to pass is high because nationally, only 50 percent of students are expected to pass introductory psychology.

Response from Pat Hogan, Business Department Chair and Lead Assessor for the “Basic Computer” competency—Pat administers two different external standardized tests (called SAM), one for all CIS 110 classes and one for all CIS 111 classes. SAM was selected because it accompanies the text adopted for these courses and is a popular test used by other colleges in the assessment process. Pat stated that 100 percent of the students in these two courses are assessed, and 90 percent are expected to perform at least 76 percent (equivalent to a grade of “C”) of the test correctly. He questioned whether the 90 percent was too high but others suggested that he keep the percentage and adjust it as needed. Pat began administering this test in 2004-05 but no data was kept. The test is administered at the end of the course and students are allotted two hours for CIS 110 and 1.5 hours for CIS 111. The test counts 20 percent of the final grade; this weight is comparable to the weight of the regular CIS tests (16 percent per test) administered by the faculty.

Response from Jill Lahnstein, English Department Chair—While all ENG 111 students, except the Internet students, are administered the ENG 111 common finals, each ENG 111 faculty member is required to submit at least one set of his/her students’ compositions for assessment; these compositions are blind-graded by a faculty member who is not the instructor of the class. This competency counts 20 percent of the final grade and is comparable to the weight of the other assigned essays in the class. ENG 111 students whose papers are not part of the assessment will have their papers graded by their instructors; their papers also will count 20 of the final grade. Eighty percent of the students assessed are expected to pass; this percentage was selected because it was considered a good solid number. In the future, Jill will include the Internet students in the assessment.

The second common final, the editing proficiency, counts 10 percent of the final grade; this final is administered in all ENG 111 classes but is not blind-graded because it is objective. English faculty grade their own papers.

Students in the ENG 114 assessment will be randomly selected for an assessment of the oral communication skills. Two-year degree students in the
technical programs demonstrate their oral communication skills by taking a general education speech course or by taking ENG 114, which requires one speech.

Response from Ken Hufham, Math/Science/PE Chair—Ken is administering common finals (objective tests) to all students in the following courses:

MAT 121-Technical Mathematics----------------Problem Solving Competency
MAT 171-Precalculus Algebra ----------------Problem Solving Competency
PHY 110-Conceptual Physics-------------------Problem Solving Competency
BIO 111-General Biology-------------------Scientific Principle/Application Competency
BIO 168-Anatomy & Physiology---------------Scientific Principle/Application Competency
BIO 169-Anatomy & Physiology II-------------Scientific Principle/Application Competency
CHM 131-Introduction to Chemistry----------Scientific Principle/Application Competency
CHM 151-General Chemistry I----------------Scientific Principle/Application Competency
GEL 120-Physical Geology--------------------Scientific Principle/Application Competency

The finals will be scored by the Math/Science/PE Chair or the Math/Science/PE Secretary. Sixty percent of the students are expected to score 70 percent of the answers correctly. Ken indicated that nationwide, about 50 percent of the students pass a math class on the first try; therefore, 60 percent is ambitious.

Response from Frank Carter, Humanities/Fine Arts Chair—Frank wants to change the “oral communication” terminology to “speaking.” He gave background information from speech experts on the minimum competency of oral communication versus the mastery of speech skills. Frank still contends that we are assessing mastery and not minimum competency when we assess formal speeches. However, he will comply with the request to continue assessing the speeches.

Frank’s speech faculty are assessing about 40 informative speeches in COM 231-Public Speaking. These speeches, five to seven minutes long, are graded by faculty who do not teach the students; these faculty will use a common rubric to assess the speeches, but the assessment results will not become part of the students’ final grades. Students present the informative speeches during the sixth week of class, after they (the students) have presented an extemporaneous speech and have received instruction on effective speaking techniques. How are the students selected for the assessment process? Whoever is presenting his/her speech on a given day, will be assessed by the assessor.

Orangel is researching websites, reading articles, and ordering books on general education assessment. We are not changing some aspects of assessment simply because others don’t understand or we don’t understand; we will find the answers and change based on sound research or collectively we will justify our
decisions. There are many stakeholders and part of our task is to satisfy the interests of all. In some states, the legislature has dictated the assessment methods.

The minutes of the General Education Assessment Council have been placed on the CFCC Intranet. Viewers must click on “General” and then “Committees.”

Orangel outlined some of the goals of the Council:

- To develop an assessment plan for the Council. Chairs will be asked to identify additional courses to be assessed. A timeline for assessment needs to be developed so that courses assessed will be on a rotating basis. The Council needs to decide if additional competencies need to be included, like the following: global perspective, critical thinking, reading, and service learning. The suggested matrix should be reviewed for the reporting of data.
- To develop an assessment handbook or assessment resources
- To conduct an assessment of the general education competencies at CFCC. Students and faculty should be assessed. Please provide any suggestions. Reminder: Council members were asked to attend the “Education” forum on Thursday, October 20, 2005, at 2pm in the S002, the McLeod Auditorium.
- To conduct a school wide meeting and share information about assessment of the competencies with the instructional area.
- To have every Council member provide input as to his/her vision for the Council.

Update on “Critical Thinking” from the QEP Chair—Because of the time element, Jason Chaffin will provide a QEP update at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.
General Education Council Meeting
Friday, October 21, 2005
Room L107, 2pm

Attendees: Grey Arey, Jason McCoy, Christian Beer, Robert Puckett, Jill Lahnstein, Pat Hogan, Larolyn Zylicz, Frank Carter, Tom Massey, Ken Hufham, Jason Chaffin, Orangel Daniels

The agenda consisted of two items: “Random Sampling,” presenter Ken Hufham, and “QEP Update,” presenter Jason Chaffin.

Random Sampling--In any study, the most important aspect is the collection of data. If sample data are not collected in an appropriate way, the data may be completely useless and no amount of statistical maneuvering can salvage them.

There are many different methods used in sampling. These include random, systematic, convenience, stratified, and cluster. Although each technique has its place in statistics, a situation where it is the most appropriate method to use, the best method in most cases is a random sampling. A random sample is a method where members of the population are selected in such a way that each individual member has an equal chance of being selected. With random samples, we expect all components of the population to be proportionately represented. That is, if the population is 42% female, then the sample will be approximately 42% female. It has been found that this technique, while not perfect, will produce a sample that is as representative of the population as possible.

Random samples can be selected using tables of computer programs. If the predictions or inferences we make about a population using a sample are to be accurate, then the sample must be a close representation of the population.

Ken Hufham, Math/Science/PE Chair, has agreed to be a resource person for those of us who must administer common finals or are involved in random sampling. Ken’s telephone extension is 7135; office, N203.

Jason Chaffin--Part of the QEP will involve designating "critical thinking" as a General Education Competency. The QEP Team has a working definition of critical thinking (CT) and believes it is a competency that can be addressed across the Gen Ed curriculum. To assess CT in our Gen Ed courses, we are considering adopting a process similar to what Surry Community College is using. This method involves randomly selecting student "artifacts" (essays, short answer exams, portfolios, projects, etc.) from across the Gen Ed curriculum and assessing them based on a common CT rubric. Surry is, in fact, using this process for all their Gen Ed competencies. The benefits of this approach are that
instructors are still free to grade the "artifacts" by their regular standards and the assessment is done by compensated inter-disciplinary teams. This could even be a pilot for a new approach to assessing Gen Ed competencies at CFCC. The QEP Team welcomes any feedback on this issue.

Orangel thanked the presenters for their presentations. The meeting ended at 2:50pm.