

Social Sciences Division

Roster & Meeting Notes about QEP & Critical Thinking Topic

Date: Jan 5, 2006

Location: JHG, Rm 225

Present: David Schuermer, Greg Jewell, Felecia Johnson, Kim Simmons, Clarissa Hill, Jeff Florea, Tim Nygaard, David Murphy, Gordon Campbell, Nevin Bard, Savanna Garrity, April Grace, Lisa Lee, Stephen Pitz, Natalie Cooper, Chet Cunningham

-
- Grace agreed that instructors can't "transfer" understanding, that we must create situations where students develop understanding—noted also that it requires some prior knowledge
 - Lee note that critical thinking must be built upon prior knowledge—we don't have any choice
 - Cooper wanted to know who the definition was going to—Jewell answered to SACS and to the students—she was concerned that putting it on the syllabus might be "overkill"—Greg noted that the QEP team thought it would establish an expectation that we could build on, that it would make our expectations explicit—he also noted that we need to change student attitudes about CT first, then work on the skills and that this sent a strong message college-wide
 - Pitz noted that he already deals with CT in his classes
 - Garrity felt the language of the definition could be simpler—she felt it would be harder to teach in Gen Ed classes—in tech classes it would be easier because it was more practical and more about application
 - Pitz noted that his course lends itself to CT
 - Cooper asked how she could do this in CIS 100 since they have 21 competencies and 4 applications?—Felecia noted that they are already doing CT in CIS 100
 - Garrity gave an example: if the flyer in book doesn't match the one they made, why? Answering that question is doing CT, i.e. applying what they were taught, then figuring out what went wrong
 - Jewell added that the QEP team felt we're already doing a lot of CT in our classes—the goal isn't to add CT "subject matter" but to use the material in your discipline to teach CT
 - Nygaard noted also that they're doing it in CIS 100—if the book says "push this button, then turn this" the goal is to get the students to think about "why," not just memorize steps
 - Bard noted that he has discussion groups answer questions about a topic before class, then asks them to apply the knowledge in class to a new situation
 - Hill noted that when we ask them to do it in class they can do it, but the often can't transfer it to the workplace—Jewell added "or to the voting booth"
 - Pitz noted that he sees a deficiency in workforce—Murphy added that the new generation is a "reaction" generation—Grace added that they're used to being spoonfed

- Jewell noted that the CT literature talk about CT disposition and skills—the disposition needs to come first before the skills can be developed
- Simmons added that students want to know the right answer—but they also need prior knowledge—there needs to be some lecture
- Murphy noted that we need to provide the experience, let them reflect upon it, expand upon it, then apply it
- Simmons asked how would students be assessed and exactly what would it mean in her class? Schuermer answered that students would need to be assessed at the college-wide level, the discipline level, and the individual classroom level—and that the QEP team wasn't yet sure how the assessment would take place because that is what the QEP process is all about, i.e. figuring out how to improve the CT skills of students
- Cooper noted that in CIS 100 instructors often disagree what to teach—she asked if faculty were released to revise the course, would everyone have to do it? Schuermer answered that revising the course to address CT would require building some kind of consensus and we would hope that faculty would agree upon competencies and how to assess them, one of them being CT