1.   **Introductions**

2.   **Q & A Assignment**

   a. Briefly describe the department's assessment program
   b. Perceived level of implementation?
   c. Perceived barriers to implementation?
   d. What assistance can the CAO provide?

3.   **HLC/NCA**
   a. Team Report
   b. Monitoring Report
         i. Department based assessment
         ii. Cross disciplinary assessment (i.e., GE Objectives #1, #2, #7)
   c. Progress Report
   d. Self-Study and Team Visit

4.   **Resources**
   a. NPEC: Standardized exams
   b. HWC: Exit Essay Criteria (i.e., locally-developed tests and scoring rubrics)
   c. Faculty Development Workshop on cross disciplinary assessments

5.   **Committee Membership**

6.   **What's next?**

HWC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
March 12, 2003 2:30pm Rm. 1136

Minutes / Background Information on Assessment to Date

In attendance: Keenan Andrews (Research & Planning), Adam S. Bounas (Mathematics), Sydney Daniels (English/Speech), Sammie Dortch (Applied Science), Uthman Erogbogbo (Biology), Jashed Fakhrid-Deen (Mathematics), Christine Franz (Instruction), Helene Gabelnick (Physical Science), Cecilia L. Lopez (VP, Academic Affairs), Denise Maduli-Williams (Foreign Language/ESL), Willard Moody (English/Speech), Armen Sarrafian (Art), Jim Schultz (Humanities), and Glenn Weller (CIS).
Absent: Lynnel Kiely (Social Science) and Bonnie Martinez (Business)

Introductions
- VP Cecilia Lopez was at NCA for 12 years, and prior to NCA, she taught for 13 years at a two-year college in California (urban area, but not as big as Chicago).
- She was involved in assessment for 7 years while at NCA.
- If any department needs help, direction, comments, please ask.
- Previous NCA team reports speak highly of HWC faculty.

HWC Assessment Committee
- Former chair, Jim Schultz
- After NCA visit, assessment undertook a different direction.
- Idea was that student assessment is independent from classroom evaluations, but there was no plan.
- Asked college for an assessment tool that can be implemented
- Focus must be on multi-section courses.
- Independent exams should be given.
- Concept was difficult because no real assessment tool for the Humanities exists.
- Committee must devise an instrument.
- Entrance requirements changed.
- It was decided last year to move to a college-wide assessment tool, but computing support is not available.
- No method is available to track students' progress over time.
- Each department uses a different assessment tool.
- Major challenges:
    - Recent challenge is ratio of full-time faculty vs. part-time adjunct lecturers
    - Can't match assessment data to cohorts
    - Can't connect departmental level assessment results to college-wide program

Humanities Department – Jim Schultz
- Written statement submitted to Cecilia Lopez.
- Several multi-section courses targeted.
- Administer one exam each semester across all courses.
- Worked out a system to grade all uniformly.
- Changed pre-requisites for enrollment in courses.
- Working with adjunct faculty to stay on target, but difficult due to the numbers of new adjunct faculty.
- Measuring progress from one semester to another (i.e., value added) is not feasible because students don't always take courses back-to-back.

Biology Department – Uthman Erogbogbo
- Department is much more interested in critical thinking.
- Designed questions to test critical thinking skills.
- A critical thinking measure is used.
- Scientific method/reasoning is emphasized throughout courses.
- Targeting Biology 114.

- Non-majors targeted and working very well; majors do much better.
- Not enough time to teach 23 chapters and then ask students to present.

Physical Science Department – Helene Gabelnick
- Written report submitted to Cecilia Lopez.
- Came back full circle – started with a department test, then used American Chemical Society (ACS) test, went back to department test, and now back to ACS test (part of final exam).
- Biggest problem is that not all faculty give results in a timely fashion; some, not at all.
- Chemistry has tried to make changes to be able to use data more efficiently.
- A college-wide science article was distributed. Students had to read and answer questions. Result: the more credit hours a student had, the worse the student did on the exam.

Art Department – Armen Sarrafian
- There are currently three multi-section courses being targeted for assessment.
- Portfolios are used in assessment; students submit a drawing for each art principle.
- Armen uses the ICCB approved syllabus.
- Score on each drawing ranges from 1 through 10 (maximum) points.
- Standards are not set for points.
    - Need to put point measures in writing to standardize and share with adjunct faculty.
    - Use a baseline
    - Is a posttest for advanced students feasible?
- Suggestion: Have faculty considered blind scoring? Can faculty rate first and second year students' artifacts anonymously to increase objectivity?

Foreign Language/ESL Department – Denise Maduli-Williams
- Decided to integrate all aspects of ESL – 1. Listening, 2. Speaking/Writing, and 3. Reading/Grammar.
- Currently using the Celsa placement test, but plan to switch to Compass, which has a writing sample section.
- Requires a lot of group time
- Using exit exams for writing in levels 4, 5, and 6.
    - Student must pass exit exam to pass course and advance to next level.
    - Exams are blind scored.
- Problems exist communicating with adjunct faculty.
- Issue is not the data because it's all there, but department is concerned with comparing scores across courses.
- Current system allows input of two scores: assessment score and final grade.

Applied Science Department – Sammie Dortch
- Applied Science Department consists of five areas: Architecture, Criminal Justice, Human Growth & Development, Mental Health, and Social Service.
- No departmental assessment tool exists.
- Very few multi-section courses offered.
    - Three assessment methods used: 1. Assessment at beginning of course, 2. Assessment then instruction, then assessment again plus one new question, and 3. Variations of assessment.

English/Speech Department
English – Willard Moody
- Too many part-time adjunct faculty – 32 this semester.
- Meetings/workshops are set-up to discuss grading and exit exams ($25 stipend to attend), but attendance at workshops is very low.
- English 98, 100, and 101: about 1800 exit essays are graded each semester, which must be read twice.
- Exit exam is used for assessment and as an entry exam for next level.
- Reporting problems exist – names on software and class list are not always the same.

- Biggest problem is the system must be updated often.

Speech – Sydney Daniels
- Assessment instrument based on Monroe's motivated sequence.
- Students are asked to present a 5-7 minute speech and provide a speaking outline.
- Points are given for each step in outline with a maximum of 100 points.
- Multi-sections available for Speech 101.
- Faculty meet after assessment to review data and compare semesters.

Mathematics Department – Adam Bounas
- Several multi-section courses are targeted for assessment.
- Biggest problem is too many part-time adjunct faculty – 23 this semester.

Additional comments/suggestions from committee
- Monitoring Report from NCA, by Dr. Taylor, states that not all general education objectives are being met. At a minimum, we need to target critical thinking, communication, and diversity college-wide.
- Can't wait on PeopleSoft to be operational.
- We need to get demographics information from students, i.e. bachelor degree earned, number of general education courses taken.
- Keenan Andrews will ask District Office what types of data are available.
- Take a different definition of assessment, i.e. the process by which faculty are communicating with students throughout the semester about their academic progress.
- Success in retaining part-time adjunct faculty
- Cecilia Lopez suggested bringing a team to visit HWC to share assessment ideas and strategies.
- Jim Schultz suggested a list of questions for the team to answer be sent prior to their visit.
- Sammy Dortch asked about the cost of bringing a team on campus. Cecilia explained dollars exist to support an assessment workshop conducted by the team for this academic year, but will not be available next fall.
- Armen suggested we ask John Wozniak regarding video conferencing equipment.
- We started general education assessment from an interdisciplinary perspective, but it didn't work.
- Writing Across the Curriculum
- Currently testing progress, but what's done afterwards?
- Irrespective of departments, we are all doing critical thinking.
- We need to define critical thinking then decide on a measure that is cross disciplinary in scope.
- Since NCA report came out (or earlier), seven areas were defined/addressed.
- NPEC created two sourcebooks (free resources):
    1. Critical thinking and problem solving - can download booklet from website, which contains the most comprehensive example of every critical thinking exam, its advantages, and its disadvantages
    2. Institutions that have used exams and what they thought about them, successes, and information
- HWC must do a better job of communicating what we are doing and how well our students are succeeding.

- Meeting adjourned at 4:28pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Angela M. Feliciano

Handouts (List): Assessment Resources
- HWC General Education Objectives in General Education Courses - OBJECTIVES
- HWC General Education Objectives in General Education Courses – RATING SCALE

- *"Assessment of Student Learning: Challenges and Strategies,"* by Cecilia L. Lopez
- *"The NPEC Sourcebook on Assessment, Volume 1: Definitions and Assessment Methods for Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Writing,"* (2000) by T. Dary Erwin
- *"The NPEC Sourcebook on Assessment, Volume 2: Selected Institutions Utilizing Assessment Results,"* (2000) by T. Dary Erwin
- *"The NPEC Sourcebook on Assessment: Definitions and Assessment Methods for Communication, Leadership, Information Literacy, Quantitative Reasoning and Quantitative Skills,"* (Currently under review) by Beth Jones and Steve RiCharde

NEXT MEETING – WED, MARCH 19, 2003 @ 2:30PM IN CONFERENCE ROOM 1136

Assessment Committee

March 17, 2003

VP Conference Room 1136

Agenda

1. Minutes/Notes of March 12

2. "Blueprint" overview for the next three academic years

3. Defining Critical Thinking

4. Assignment

5. Announcements:
    a. Committee composition / additions
    b. April 04:   Assessment Workshop @ Daley College
    c. April 27-28:   Tentative dates for Assessment Workshop conducted by a three-person team from Mesa Community College

6. Future Meeting Dates (2:30 to 3:30pm)
    a. March 26
    b. April 02
    c. April 09
    d. April 23
    e. April 30
    f. May 07
    g. May 14

HWC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
March 19, 2003 2:30pm Rm. 1136

<u>Minutes / Background Information on Assessment to Date</u>

In attendance: Keenan Andrews (Research & Planning), Jennifer Asimow (Applied Science), Sydney Daniels (English/Speech), Sammie Dortch (Applied Science), Uthman Erogbogbo (Biology), Jashed Fakhrid-Deen (Mathematics), Christine Franz (Instruction), Helene Gabelnick (Physical Science), Lynnel Kiely (Social Science), Cecilia L. Lopez (VP, Academic Affairs), Denise Maduli-Williams (Foreign Language/ESL), Willard Moody (English/Speech), Jim Schulz (Humanities), and Glenn Weller (CIS).
Absent: Adam Bounas (Mathematics), Bonnie Martinez (Business), Armen Sarrafian (Art)

Review Minutes/Notes of March 12<u>th</u> meeting
- Revision: ESL: Plan to switch to COMPASS, which has reading and listening sections.
- CIS will e-mail a short synopsis to include in minutes for 3/12/03 meeting.

Action Plan/"Blueprint" for next three academic years
- Project management software that will allow for breakdown by academic year
- Must identify resources that will be needed.
- Determine how we can define operational constructs for Critical Thinking.
- What cohorts will be chosen and when?
- Host an Assessment Day/Week to provide information regarding assessment practices

Defining Critical Thinking
- Everyone in each department is doing Critical Thinking.
- We must define Critical Thinking and respect each department's definition of Critical Thinking.
- Whether a student graduates with an AA, AAS, AES, or AGS (focusing on AA & AS, but will bring in AAS with some changes), we need to know the degree to which students are able to think critically and solve problems.
- Handout distributed: "Critical Thinking and Problem Solving"
    - By National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC), an unbiased source
    - Based on a comprehensive study done of five hundred scholars across the nation
    - Provides a broad definition of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving and identifies differences in each
    - Check out NPEC's interactive website for additional information
- Determine operational definition used on standardized tests, and correlate scores with other types of measures – may or may not be useful

Assignment
- Need to come to consensus on definition of Critical Thinking.
- Definition cannot be discipline specific.
- Committee agreed to review NPEC's definition; however, "unlimited number of solutions" will be changed.
- Committee is to take definition back to departments and share with faculty and determine if:
    1) Do they distinguish between Critical Thinking and Problem Solving?
    2) Faculty accepts NPEC's definition(s) – Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
    3) How can NPEC's definition be tweaked?

Other issues discussed
- Do you feel it is important to separate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving? Does faculty generally agree that they are one in the same or very similar?
- Sammie Dortch – Problem Solving is not just Problem Solving, but identifying problem and solutions. Critical Thinking always looks at issues from both sides, which may or may not be implied.
- Must think above the level of one discipline.
- What will the students be able to do? What competencies or skills will student possess?
- Identify at least 3-4 subcategories: Define characteristics of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, and ask, "If a student is thinking critically, what observable behaviors can we identify to show Critical Thinking?
- After consensus of broad definition, what are characteristics of each?
- There is no such thing as a perfect exam/test.

- Multiple measures must be used; no one measure can capture the complexity of the construct.
- Must enhance students' capacity to do x and y.
- Jennifer Asimow: Are we looking at formative and summative assessment? Yes, for the money we are spending, we are looking at both, and we'll use it for internal policy making.
- Denise Wilkin: In the end, are we looking to give the same assessment in each discipline? No, since mistakes always occur in the beginning, we will start with a small population – about 300 students.
- Multi-section courses will be selected.
- One possible cohort is students with fewer than 6 credit hours in general education or fewer than 6 credit hours at HWC.
- Faculty must be trained on administering and scoring examinations

- By Fall 2003, hope to have identified Critical Thinking measures, administer CCSSE exam (2nd year pilot), identify an indirect measure which provides information on students, and determine what conditions enhance or detract from students' learning.

Additional comments/suggestions from committee
- Sylvia Hurtado of University of Michigan has devised a diversity measure and modified it to be used at the community colleges. Cecilia Lopez is trying to obtain this measure and invite Ms. Hurtado to visit HWC.
- A random sample of high enrollment classes will be selected for Critical Thinking exam, diversity exam, and possibly a third measure (i.e. CCSSE)
- Assessment Workshop scheduled for April 4, 2003 at Daley College. Peter Faccione will be guest speaker.
- Committee should recommend a test, either from the list that was distributed or from the NPEC website.
  - Narrow down your selection to three
  - Irrespective of cost, what is the most useful?
  - Will test provide information that can be taken back to the classroom
  - We do not have to worry about District Office approving test.
  - Must consider tests that students can complete within one class period.

- Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Angela M. Feliciano

Handouts (List): Assessment Resources
  - *Critical Thinking and Problem Solving*, NPEC: The NPEC Sourcebook on Assessment, Volume 1: Definitions and Assessment Methods for Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Writing.

NEXT MEETING – WED, MARCH 26, 2003 @ 2:30PM IN CONFERENCE ROOM 1136

Assessment Committee
Agenda

3/25/03

1.   Committee Membership

2.   Consensus
     a.   Separate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving?
     b.   Implications of decision
     c.   Departmental perspectives on defining Critical Thinking
     d.   Agreement on a multi-disciplinary approach to defining Critical Thinking

3.   Updates
     a.   Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
     b.   Diversity measure

4.   Assessment Workshops
     a.   ICCB: Critical Thinking @ Daley College: April 4
     b.   Mesa Community College @ HWC: April 24 -25

5.   Assignment for April 02, 2003
     a.   Review NPEC website: http://nces.ed.gov/npec/evaltests/

i.	AP	Academic Profile
ii.	CAAP	Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency
iii.	CCTST	California Critical Thinking Skills Test
iv.	CCTT	Cornell Critical Thinking Test
v.	MID	Measure of Intellectual Development
vi.	PSI	Problem Solving Inventory
vii.	RJI	Reflective Judgment Inventory
viii.	WG	Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal

     b.   Considering the agreed-upon definition of Critical Thinking, choose THREE measures that are potentially viable and worth the Committee's time to investigate in-depth
     c.   Be prepared to provide a rationale for your Department's choices

6.   Future Meeting Dates (2:30-3:30)
     a.   April 09
     b.   April 23
     c.   April 30
     d.   May 07
     e.   May 14

HWC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
March 26, 2003 2:30pm Rm. 1136

Minutes / Background Information on Assessment to Date

In attendance: Keenan Andrews (Research & Planning), Jennifer Asimow (Applied Science), Adam Bounas (Mathematics), Sydney Daniels (English/Speech), Sammie Dortch (Applied Science), Uthman Erogbogbo (Biology), Christine Franz (Instruction), Helene Gabelnick (Physical Science), Lynnel Kiely (Social Science), Cecilia L. Lopez (VP, Academic Affairs), Willard Moody (English/Speech), Armen Sarrafian (Art), and Glenn Weller (CIS).

Absent: Jashed Fakhrid-Deen (Mathematics), Denise Maduli-Williams (Foreign Language/ESL), Bonnie Martinez (Business), and James Schulz (Humanities)

Review Minutes/Notes of March 19th meeting
- Minutes/notes reviewed and approved.

Committee Membership
- Every academic department must be involved/represented at assessment meetings.
- **Motion to expand committee to include:**
    - Student representative – Student perspective and deposition is important. Students must be made aware of assessment purposes and efforts at HWC. Have asked Saundra Banyard to recommend a student from Phi Theta Kappa or Student Government Association.
    - Student Affairs representative – Need a student representative perspective when dealing with issues of student development.
    - Center for Distance Learning representative – Enrollment is high in CDL (about 3000 student per year)
    - Library representative – Will ask Bill Locke to recommend someone from library. Information Literacy is not one of HWC's seven general education goals, but should be. American Library Association has published an extensive definition of Information Literacy that is applicable to all disciplines.
    - Faculty Council – Armen suggested that Faculty Council should be represented on the It's important to keep Council informed of assessment issues and activities. Committee members agreed. Armen will ask Council to deputize a representative.

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
Last week's assignment was two-fold:
1) Do we want to separate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving?
2) Does faculty approve NPEC's definition of Critical Thinking? Will it be revised? Will we develop our own definition?

Members agreed on a vote of 5 to 2 to separate Critical Thinking from Problem Solving.
- ➤ English: Combine. Problem Solving is part of Critical Thinking. Department provided definition.
- ➤ Speech: Separate. 3 faculty members said Critical Thinking and Problem Solving should be separated; 1 faculty member said they were similar. Department provided definition.
- ➤ Physical Science: Separate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. Department provided definition.

➢ Social Science: Separate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. Department will e-mail definition.
➢ Applied Science: Separate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. Department provided definition.
➢ Biology: Determined that the decision depends on the task at hand. Department provided definition.
➢ Art: Separate Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. Department provided definition.
➢ Information Technology: Combine Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. Department provided definition.
➢ Math: Department's decision was not provided.
➢ Foreign Languages/ESL: Department's decision was not provided

Discussion

o What are the implications of separating Critical Thinking and Problem Solving? Workload issues were acknowledged. Committee member also pointed out that for those departments that elected to separate, they would have to keep track of two sets of numbers, two exams,etc.

o English Department: If separating Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, there's no need to develop a measure for Problem Solving, we can just use the Department's exit exam. A scoring rubric would have to be developed, however.

o Some standardized Critical Thinking exams contain a Problem Solving section, and a number of measures incorporate both.

o From the standardized measures available from NPEC to review, Committee members could choose a Critical Thinking measure that contains items focused on Problem Solving.

o Question: Why couldn't we use a locally developed Critical Thinking measure versus a Problem Solving one? Isn't Problem Solving more objective? VP Lopez responded that most community college faculty members use a standardized measure of Critical Thinking, which contains Problem Solving items, or they have developed their own Problem Solving measure. Most colleges have reported that trying to create their own cross-disciplinary Critical Thinking exam is expensive and time-consuming. Additionally, since there are so many measures of Critical Thinking on the market (nine of which have been extensively evaluated by a fairly unbiased source, NPEC), but few measures entirely focused on Problem Solving, choosing a standardized measure for Critical Thinking is a practical solution to help us move forward on assessing student learning and achievement.

o Committee members may choose to develop their own measure and scoring rubric for Problem Solving. A number of locally developed (i.e., faculty developed) "authentic-based" Problem Solving measures and scoring rubrics already exist and could be modified for our use should Committee members choose to do so. Most measures of this type include an "authentic-based" prompt, cross-disciplinary readings, followed by the students' written response. Scoring student work with an agreed-upon scoring rubric requires faculty training and time. If we decide to do this, a reasonable timeframe for implementation would be fall 2004.

o VP Lopez expects that by November 2003, at a minimum, a measure of Critical Thinking will be administered to a pre- and post-cohort of the faculty's choosing. Thus, the Committee has the responsibility to decide which measure best aligns with faculty's interdisciplinary view of what any student who has had an educational experience at HWC should be able to demonstrate.

o VP Lopez anticipates that in addition to a measure of Critical Thinking, she anticipates that we may also be ready by November 2003 to administer the CCSSE and a measure on Diversity.

o **Cohorts:** The Critical Thinking cohort and Problem Solving cohort could be different cohorts. Also, since we need baseline data, a "Value-Added" model would make sense if we were to use pre- and post-test cohorts.

o **Sample:** We will sample the population. The sample can be chosen using the same methodology departments have employed previously: i.e., random selection of high-enrollment, multi-section classes. For the administration of the Critical Thinking measure and the CCSSE in fall 2003, the sample will be small since limited information from SPAS and District is available. A small sample size will make Keenan's job doable, and the effects of inevitable mistakes will be minimized.

Assignment

❖ Get as many faculty involved as possible to visit NPEC's website: http://nces.ed.gov/npec/evaltests/

❖ **Select THREE measures for further review by the Committee. Please be prepared to provide a rationale for each Department's three selections.**

❖ Faculty should review the standardized exams listed on today's Agenda.

❖ Measures must meet classroom time limitations, i.e., be administered during one class period.

❖ Cost is not a factor at this moment. We will use the exam that Committee members determine most closely represents what HWC faculty expect students who demonstrate characteristics consistent with a competent critical thinker (and problem solver) to be able to do.

❖ Encourage department faculty to define HWC's **GOAL** that students should think critically in terms of observable or measurable **LEARNER OUTCOMES**. (Please refer to the handouts for definitions of these terms.)

❖ Faculty members need to determine the characteristics of how a student would demonstrate that they could think critically.

❖ If faculty members want to include Problem Solving, they should consider selecting an exam that contains both.

❖ The Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) is specific to Problem Solving, but may overlap with Critical Thinking.

❖ Once Committee members have agreed on three selections, VP Lopez will contact publishers and obtain copies of each for Committee members' review.

❖ Committee members will be asked to actually "take" each exam to determine which of the three:
  ▪ aligns most closely with faculty's determination of appropriate learner outcomes

- provides useful formative and summative information about student learning and achievement
- can be completed in the allotted time frame
- is appropriate for our student population.

Updates

o Keenan is working with the University of Texas, Austin, the producers of the CCSSE survey instrument. She is trying to get them to visit HWC Friday, May 2, 2003 – (Armin will determine if this date conflicts with the Union annual luncheon.)

o VP Lopez is still working to get information about Diversity measures from two sources: UCLA and the University of Michigan. Will get back to Committee later.

o We have a team of nine Committee members who will be attending the day-long ICCB Assessment Workshop at Daley College on April 4, 2003

o Mesa Community College assessment team will visit HWC on April 24-25, 2003. An invitation will be sent to all faculty to attend the two-day workshop: approximately two hours in the afternoon of the 24th and two hours in the morning of the 25th, followed by a question and answer session. Please ask department faculty if there are specific topics or information that they would particularly like for the Mesa team to address.

Additional comments/suggestions/questions from Committee Members

✓ VP Lopez was invited to the Public Agency and Special Programs meeting (PASP). VP Lopez commented about the Taxi Program and the thousands of enrollees in the program. PASP produces students that learn about our academic programs while taking the taxi certification course then subsequently enroll at HWC.

✓ Question: Are special programs under NCA rubric? Yes, NCA accredits the entire college and all of its offerings not just specific programs.

✓ Faculty need to distinguish between goals and learner outcomes

GOAL #1: "Think critically, analyze and solve problems"

↓

LEARNING OUTCOMES?

CHARACTERISTICS: - Observable behaviors (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy)

                   - MEASURABLE - quantitatively or qualitatively

Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela M. Feliciano

Handouts (List): Assessment Resources

- *"Critical Thinking Across the Curriculum Project,"* Longview Community College (MO)
- *"Critical Thinking Competency Rubric,"* Rio Salado College (AZ)
- *"Assessing the Effectiveness of Instructional Units,"* Austin Community College (TX)
- *"Types of Learning Outcomes to Consider,"* Ball State University <u>Assessment Workbook,</u>
- 1992

NEXT MEETING – WED, APRIL 2, 2003 @ 2:30PM IN CONFERENCE ROOM 1136

Assessment Committee
Agenda

4/02/03

1.   **Committee Membership**

2.   **Discussion**
   a.   Departments' agreement on NPEC's definition of Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
   b.   Departments' three choices for review of measures of Critical Thinking based on faculty's review of NPEC's website.
   c.   Departments' rationale for each of the three choices

3.   **Updates**
   a.   Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
   b.   Diversity measures

4.   **Reminders: Assessment Workshops**
   a.   ICCB: Critical Thinking @ Daley College: April 4
   b.   Mesa Community College @ HWC: April 24 -25

5.   **Assignment for April 02, 2003**
   a.   Given HWC's goal of critical thinking, work with department faculty to decide on a minimum of three interdisciplinary learning outcomes. Handouts of 3/26/03 provide suggestions for creating measurable learning outcomes
   b.   Learning outcomes should be student-focused (e.g., what the student should be able to do or demonstrate).

6.   **Future Meeting Dates (2:30-3:30)**
   a.   April 23
   b.   April 30
   c.   May 07
   d. May 14

<div align="center">

HWC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
April 4, 2003
2:30pm Rm. 1136

</div>

<div align="center">

Minutes / Background Information on Assessment to Date

</div>

In attendance: Keenan Andrews (Research & Planning), Sydney Daniels (English/Speech), Sammie Dortch (Applied Science), Uthman Erogbogbo (Biology), Jashed Fakhrid-Deen (Mathematics), Christine Franz (Instruction), Helene Gabelnick (Physical Science), Lynnel Kiely (Social Science), Cecilia L. Lopez (VP, Academic Affairs), Denise Maduli-Williams (Foreign Language/ESL), Willard Moody (English/Speech), Celia Perez (Library), Armen Sarrafian (Art), Paul Urbanick (Humanities), and Glenn Weller (CIS).

Absent: Jennifer Asimow (Applied Science), Adam Bounas (Mathematics), Thurman Gardner (Business), Bonnie Martinez (Business), and James Schulz (Humanities).

Welcome New Member
- Celia Perez joins the Assessment Committee representing the Library.

Review Minutes/Notes of March 26<u>th</u> meeting
- Minutes/notes reviewed and approved.

Assignment for 4/2/03 meeting
- From the NPEC grid provided, review each of the sub-skills associated with the following six categories of critical thinking skills: Interpretation, Analysis, Evaluation, Inference, Presenting Arguments, and Reflection.
- Reach consensus as to the relative importance of each of the six skills.
- Review available standardized exams of critical thinking available on NPEC's website.
- Choose three instruments that most closely align with the skills your department faculty consider are essential for a graduate of HWC to demonstrate.

Issues
- There is no perfect test. No one instrument will address all the skills listed in the NPEC grid. Select a measure that best addresses categories of skills that are important to HWC.
- When selections are made, VP Lopez will contact publishers and request copies of tests for Assessment Committee members, and if available, additional copies for full-time faculty.
- Committee members and faculty should take the tests to get feedback. For example, is the test appropriate for HWC's student population? Does the test address skills that are important to departments? Does the instrument provide useful information for faculty?
- Committee members will need to decide on pre- and post- cohorts.
  - ✓ Pre- students with 6 credit hours in general education courses or less?
  - ✓ Post- students with 30-38 credit hours in general education courses or more?
- SPAS does not have the capacity to track the same students from pre- to post.
- Lynnel Kiely found the website to be cumbersome and preferred the NPEC grid that VP Lopez provided easier to use.
- Faculty requested a copy of the NPEC grid in order to compare tests instead of only viewing NPEC's website.
- Not all departments want to track pre- and post- cohorts.
- Three cohorts could be selected instead of two:
  - Students with fewer than 6 credit hours in general education
  - Students with 15-18 credit hours in general education
  - Students with 35 or more credit hours in general education
- We will work to reach a consensus within departments and then as a group (Committee)
- Grid will be scanned and tests not appropriate will be removed. Grid will be more condensed and will include tests Committee should be considering for review.

The table below reflects a first effort to narrow our choices to three instruments:

Department	AP	CAAP	CCTST	CCTT	MID	PSI	RJI	WGCTA
Appl Sci	X		X					
Art			X			X^3		
Biology	X		X					X
Business								
CIS			X	X				X
English			X	X				
FL/ESL	X^1		X	X				
Humanities								
Library								
Mathematics								
Phys Sci		X^2	X	X				
Soc Sci								
Speech			X					
TOTAL	**3**	**1**	**8**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**

[1] FL/ESL – department selected the Academic Profile (AP). However, faculty members feel that interpretation and inference are important, but the AP test doesn't test for them.

[2] Test states that it is used with "end of the year sophomores" (35+ credit hours)

[3] Uses a lickert-type statement, one that requires a rating scale: very pleased, somewhat pleased, not pleased, etc. The PSI is an indirect measure of student learning.

NOTE: MISSING INPUT FROM BUSINESS, HUMANITIES, LIBRARY, MATH AND SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS.

Updates
- Assessment Committee members will hear from Peter Faccione on Friday, April 4th at Daley College Assessment Workshop
- Keenan is working with CCSSE, trying to get them to visit HWC – Friday, May 2, 2003 – may conflict with union annual luncheon (Armen Sarrafian will check with Mike Ruggeri-union rep.).
- VP Lopez has a PowerPoint presentation regarding CCSSE, but would rather have a representative from provide a presentation.
- VP Lopez is working to get Diversity measures information from University of Michigan, but has not been successful in speaking with Sylvia Hurtado. VP will ask Mesa Community College to bring the University of Michigan's revised measure when they visit HWC on April 24-25, 2003.
- VP Lopez received information from the University of Southern California regarding a diversity measure: Diversity Scorecard Framework. It is not a direct measure that we can use with students. For example, a college may wish to examine the number of Hispanic students getting a degree and whether they go into Math and/or Science fields. The Scorecard defines terms as indicators, such as access and affordability. For example: what "access" target do we want to improve? Have we reached it? It's a measure of institutional effectiveness and not a measure of student learning. The Scorecard may be useful for some aspect of HWC Goal #7 but it does not appear to address student attitudes towards Diversity.
- Keenan Andrews will review the Scorecard and report back to the Committee.

Additional comments/suggestions from committee
-Assessment Workshop at Daley College on April 4, 2003. VP Lopez will take the HWC van and all going are welcome to ride along. She will depart from HWC at 8:15am to Daley College.

Meeting adjourned at 3:37pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela M. Feliciano

Handouts (List): Assessment Resources
- Critical Thinking Tests Grid. Compiled using The NPEC Sourcebook on Assessment, 2000.

NEXT MEETING: WED, APRIL 9, 2003 @ 2:30pm in CONFERENCE ROOM 1136

Assessment Committee
Agenda

4/09/03

1. **Blackboard and the Assessment Committee: Ephrem Rabin**

2. **Discussion**
   a. Departments' agreement on critical thinking skill priorities: Interpretation, Analysis, Evaluation, Inference, Presenting Arguments, and Reflection.
   b. Departments' agreement on the top three choices for in-depth review of measures of Critical Thinking based on faculty's review of NPEC's website and NPEC's Skills Grid.
   c. Departments' rationale for each of the three choices based on skill priorities

3. **Updates**
   a. Sub-committee on Information Literacy — *Glenn Weller/Bill Locke/Jim Schultz*
   b. Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
   c. Diversity Scoreboard

   Keenan Andrews — 2 things recommend y Info literacy is a goal — where should it be embedded

look at Diversity Scoreboard as well — strategic planning will look at this

4. **Reminders: Assessment Workshops**
   a. Mesa Community College @ HWC: April 24 -25
   — *2 separate workshops /must attend both*

5. **Assignment for April 23, 2003**
   a. Given HWC's goal of critical thinking, work with department faculty to decide on a minimum of three interdisciplinary learning outcomes. Handouts of 3/26/03 provide suggestions for creating measurable learning outcomes, or faculty may wish to use NPEC's Skills Grid
   b. Learning outcomes should be student-focused (e.g., what the student should be able to do or demonstrate).
   c. Decide on characteristics of and rationale for Pre-and Post cohorts (4th bullet under "Issues" 4/4/03 Minutes)   *for discussion*

   200 level students

6. **Future Meeting Dates (2:30-3:30)**
   a. April 23
   b. April 30
   c. May 07
   d. May 14

   pre-test →
   post-test →

   — Submit issues to Angela for questions for friday morning

Minutes

In attendance: Keenan Andrews (Research & Planning), Jennifer Asimow (Applied Science), Sydney Daniels (English/Speech), Sammie Dortch (Applied Science), Uthman Erogbogbo (Biology), Jashed Fakhrid-Deen (Mathematics), Helene Gabelnick (Physical Science), Thurman Gardner (Business), Lynnel Kiely (Social Science), Cecilia L. Lopez (VP, Academic Affairs), Denise Maduli-Williams (Foreign Language/ESL), Willard Moody (English/Speech), Ephrem Rabin (Presenter), Armen Sarrafian (Art), and Glenn Weller (CIS).

Absent: Christine Franz (Instruction), Celia Perez (Library), Paul Urbanick (Humanities).

Review Minutes/Notes of April 2nd meeting
Minutes reviewed and approved.

BBOC: Blackboard and the Assessment Committee
- Ephrem Rabin led Committee members through a demonstration of Blackboard on Campus (BBOC)
- Web site for BBOC: http://ccc.blackboard.com
- DOCUMENTS: Assessment materials (i.e. agendas, minutes, published articles, and NPEC grid) can be accessed through the Assessment Blackboard site. Scoring rubrics for various departments from other colleges will be added.
- COMMUNICATION: E-mail, with and without attachments, can be sent within Blackboard.
- DISCUSSION BOARDS: Committee members can have a dialogue between meetings. VP Lopez can only set up forums, but anyone can respond.
- VP Lopez will send an e-mail to all Committee members when new documents are posted on Blackboard.
- Blackboard will eliminate the need to photocopy all documents. Faculty can be referred to the BBOC's Assessment web site.
- VP Lopez strongly encourages all faculty members to become familiar with and use BBOC.

Critical Thinking Measures: Discussion
- There is no perfect test. No one instrument will address all the skills listed in the NPEC grid. Select a measure that best aligns with the categories of critical thinking skills that are important to faculty.

- When considering which measure is a "best fit,"
    - ➢ rate the relative importance of each critical thinking skill category: **Interpretation, Analysis, Evaluation, Inference, Presenting Arguments, and Reflection.**
    - ➢ take into account what department faculty expect as critical thinking learning outcomes for students who have successfully completed the general education curriculum.
    - ➢ remember that no instrument measures all of the skill categories or all of the subcategories of skills that are possible for each of the above seven categories.

- Committee members and faculty should take the tests to get feedback. For example, is the test appropriate for HWC's student population? Does the test address skills that are important to departments? Does the instrument provide useful information for faculty?

The table below reflects a second effort to narrow our choices to three instruments. Preferences are rated 1=first choice, 2=second choice, 3=third choice, and 4=fourth choice.

Department	AP	CAAP	CCTST	CCTT	MID	PSI	RJI	WGCTA	DTLS*
Applied Sci	2		1						
Art			1					2	
Biology	1		2					3	
Business			1	2					
CIS			2	1				3	
English			1	2					
FL/ESL			1	2				3	
Humanities									
Library			1	2				3	
Mathematics			1	2				3	4
Physical Sci			1					2	
Social Sci			1	2				3	
Speech			1						
TOTAL	3	0	12	7	0	0	0	8	1

*Descriptive Testing of Language Skills (DTLS): Critical Thinking. Used by Jack Lombard in 1997.

NOTE: VP Lopez will obtain a copy of the CCTST, CCTT, and WGCTA for the next meeting of the Assessment Committee.

Updates

- Assessment Committee members attended Peter Faccione's session on Friday, April 4th at Daley College Assessment Workshop. Dr. Faccione referred to the CCTST, which may be administered on-line.
- Keenan is working with CCSSE to visit HWC – Friday, May 2, 2003 at 9:00am
- HWC Strategic Planning Committee has decided to investigate the USC's diversity measure: Diversity Scorecard Framework. Keenan Andrews will review the Scorecard and report back to the Committee.
- REMINDER: Mesa Community College's Assessment Workshops on Thursday, April 24th from 2:00-5:00pm and Friday, April 25th from 9:00-12:00pm.

Assignment for 4/23/03 meeting
- Given HWC's goal of critical thinking, work with department faculty to decide on a minimum of three interdisciplinary learning outcomes. Handouts of 3/26/03 provide suggestions for creating measurable learning outcomes, or faculty may wish to use NPEC's Skills Grid.
- Learning outcomes should be student-focused (i.e. what the student should be able to do or demonstrate).
- Decide on characteristics of and rationale for Pre- and Post- cohorts (4th bullet under "Issues" 4/4/03 Minutes). At what point do we say that the student should have enough general education courses to qualify for post- cohort?

Additional comments/suggestions from committee

- Interdisciplinary usually means something different for Art Department. Should faculty work more closely within department? VP Lopez strongly encourages faculty to explore cross-disciplinary opportunities for assessing student learning across the HWC's General Education seven learning outcomes.

- Consider using Bloom's Taxonomy to assist in developing and writing measurable learning outcomes.

- English 101 eligibility? Eligibility for English 101 is a College prerequisite for enrollment into any college-level course.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela M. Feliciano

Handouts (List): Assessment Resources

- Blackboard on Campus (BBOC) Handout: *Assessment Committee Blackboard Site*, by Ephrem Rabin.

- Critical Thinking Skills Rating Grid

- Descriptive Tests of Language Skills in Critical Thinking, by Multiple Assessment Programs & Services (MAPS), The College Board, Educational Testing Service, ©1989.

NEXT MEETING: WED, APRIL 23, 2003 @ 2:30pm
in CONFERENCE ROOM 1136

Assessment Committee
Agenda

4/30/03

1.   **Discussion**
    a. Departments' agreement on critical thinking skill priorities: Interpretation, Analysis, Evaluation, Inference, Presenting Arguments, and Reflection.
    b. Departments' agreement on cross-disciplinary learning outcomes for Critical Thinking?
    c. CCTST, CCTT, and the WG measures of Critical Thinking
    d. Departments' agreement on characteristics and rationale for Pre- and Post cohorts?

2.   **Updates**
    a. Sub-committee on Information Literacy
    b. Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
    c. Diversity Scoreboard

3.   **Assessment Workshops**
    a. **June 22-24, 2003:** American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Assessment Conference, Seattle, WA
    b. **July 26-29, 2003:** Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC) Summer Assessment Academy, Denver, CO

4.   **Assignment for May 07, 2003**
    a. Review CCTST (11), CCTT (6), and the WG (7) against the agreed upon priorities for thinking skills (Interpretation, Analysis, Evaluation, Inference, Presenting Arguments, and Reflection). We will determine if we have consensus on the measure that is most closely aligned with (a) the thinking skills faculty deem are important and (b) with expected critical thinking learning outcomes for "completers."
    b. Distribute proposed cross-disciplinary learning outcomes for critical thinking. Agreement?
    c. Distribute proposed pre- and post-cohort characteristics. Agreement?

5.   **Future Meeting Dates (2:30 - 3:30)**
    a. May 07
    b. May 14

HWC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
April 30, 2003
2:30pm Rm. 1136

Minutes

In attendance: Keenan Andrews (Research & Planning), Sydney Daniels (English/Speech), Sammie Dortch (Applied Science), Uthman Erogbogbo (Biology), Christine Franz (Instruction), Helene Gabelnick (Physical Science), Lynnel Kiely (Social Science), Cecilia L. Lopez (VP, Academic Affairs), Denise Maduli-Williams (Foreign Language/ESL), Willard Moody (English/Speech), Celia Perez (Library), Armen Sarrafian (Art), and Glenn Weller (CIS).

Absent: Jennifer Asimow (Applied Science), Jashed Fakhrid-Deen (Mathematics), Thurman Gardner (Business), and Paul Urbanick (Humanities).

Review Minutes/Notes of April 9th meeting
Please review minutes and forward any corrections to Angela Feliciano.

Assessment Workshops: Dr. Hurtado (Univ. of Michigan) & Mesa Community College: Discussion

- As a result of Dr. Sylvia Hurtado's Diversity Workshop and Mesa Community College's Assessment Workshop, several discussions regarding diversity, general education, developmental education took place. VP López encourages these discussions to continue.
- Dr. Hurtado has granted HWC permission to use her diversity measure, which was modified by Mesa Community College. Mesa has been using the modified version of Dr. Hurtado's diversity measure for the past two years.
- VP Lopez is hesitant about putting the diversity measure out without the faculty first having the opportunity to define Diversity and to develop learning outcomes for this construct.
- The Assessment Committee will begin the discussion about learning outcomes for Diversity during the next meeting scheduled for 5/7/03.
- Mesa Community College gained the strong support of its Faculty Senate, and all faculty members (F/T and P/T) are knowledgeable about the College's assessment efforts.
- Glen Weller inquired about the levels of assessment at Mesa since the Mesa team only focused on program level assessment rather than classroom or course level assessment. VP López replied that she had requested the Mesa team to focus on programmatic level assessment since HWC is currently assessing student competencies at the course level, in multi-section courses.

ACTION ITEM:
- Helene Gabelnick suggested that committees should be established for each of the seven general education goals to continue and advance the discussion on a cross-disciplinary approach to each goal. She further suggested that the chair of each committee should not be in the discipline.
- **Committee members agreed to the following:**
  - VP López will inform faculty of the opportunity to volunteer for an interdisciplinary goal committee, consisting of three to four members, but not limited to four.

o The interdisciplinary goals committees will be encouraged to meet during the first three days of Faculty Development Week at a time when committee members are not involved in registration duties.

Discussion and Informational Items

- Critical Thinking assessment will be scheduled for November 2003
- While moving forward with programmatic level assessment, multi-section course level assessment will continue to be conducted.
- VP López recommends not aligning assessment scores with grades. It is problematic and inconsistent with good practice to do so.
- The software currently in use to record assessment scores and grades was developed by James Schulz. However, once he retires, the software program cannot be supported. Consequently, James Schultz has volunteered to research TrakDat, which aligns faculty stated expected learning outcomes with assessment scores, to determine its applicability and usefulness for our needs.
- The Assessment Committee will be involved in writing the report for NCA. NCA is not interested in test scores, let alone grades. Instead, NCA will want evidence of the dissemination of assessment data, the interpretation and discussion of those data by faculty, and evidence of how assessment information has been used to improve student learning, through changes in pedagogy, course content, curriculum, learning resources, and/or student services.
- How do we establish a baseline? Must look at what we have done and keep what's useful. If course level assessment is working, then continue doing.
- VP Lopez has not had a chance to look at the data that has been collected thus far.

Assignment for 05/07/03 meeting

Take tests distributed at meeting on 4/30/03. Consider choosing one faculty member for each test.

1) California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) – 45 min., paper & pencil only
2) Cornell Critical Thinking Test (CCTT) – 50 min., paper & pencil and on-line
3) Watson-Glacier Critical Thinking Appraisal (WGCTA) – 40 min., paper & pencil and on-line

When taking tests:
- Time yourself (student should be able to take test in one class period)
- Think in terms of students (Low level and high level)
- How closely does this test align with the skill categories that are important to your department? (Critical Thinking skill categories can be accessed via NPEC's website at http://nces.ed.gov/npec/evaltests/
- Decide if this test will yield information that is useful to faculty.

Assessment Workshops

❖ **June 22-24, 2003:** American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Assessment Conference, Seattle, WA

❖ **July 26-29, 2003:** Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC) Summer Assessment Academy, Denver, CO

❖ **November 3-4, 2003:** Indiana University – Perdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN

> - Please let VP López know if you would like to attend any of the three conferences. Slots are limited for the Seattle and Denver conferences.
> - Faculty will be expected share their conference learning/experiences with the Committee.

Additional comments/suggestions from Committee Members

- Once VP López has received each department's ratings for the NPEC Critical Thinking categories, she will e-mail the results to Committee members. Please submit your Department's ratings, if you have not already done so.

- VP López will find out what reports are generated from the Critical Thinking tests.

- The Descriptive Tests of Language Skills in Critical Reasoning was administered under Jack Lombard's leadership in 1997 and never again. The problem is that the literature for the test indicates that it is a measure for placement testing, which is not appropriate for assessment of student learning. It is a "low-level" test in that two-thirds of the students who take the test are guaranteed to pass. Denise Maduli-Williams volunteered to review the measure for possible use in developmental education.

ACTION ITEM:

Committee members agreed to the following characteristics for pre- and post-test cohorts:
- ➤ **Pre:** 6 - 7 credits in general education or fewer, AND eligible for English 101. (SPAS does not state eligibility for English 101, but is does provide placement test scores)
- ➤ **Post:** 32 credits in general education or more, AND at least one course in each discipline

Meeting adjourned at 3:42 pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela M. Feliciano

Handouts (List): Assessment Resources
- California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) Form A, B and Answer Sheet, by Dr. Peter A. Facione, California Academic Press, © 1990.

- Cornell Critical Thinking Test (CCTT) Level X and Level Z, By Robert H. Ennis and Jason Millman, Critical Thinking Books & Software, © 1985

NEXT MEETING:

WED., MAY 7, 2003 @ 2:30pm in CONFERENCE ROOM 1136

Assessment Committee
Agenda

5/07/03

1. **Discussion**
   a. Do we have agreement on the CCTST, CCTT, and the WG measures of Critical Thinking?
   b. Departments' agreement on critical thinking skill priorities: Interpretation, Analysis, Evaluation, Inference, Presenting Arguments, and Reflection.
   c. Departments' agreement on cross-disciplinary learning outcomes for Critical Thinking?
   d. Departments' agreement on characteristics and rationale for Pre- and Post cohorts?

2. **Updates**
   a. Sub-committee on Information Literacy
   b. Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
   c. Diversity Scoreboard

3. **Assessment Conferences**
   a. **June 22-24, 2003:** American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Assessment Conference, Seattle, WA
   b. **July 26-29, 2003:** Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC) Summer Assessment Academy, Denver, CO
   c. **November 3-4,** 2003: IUPUI Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN

4. **Assignment for May 14, 2003**
   a. Consider cross-disciplinary committees/team meetings for the first three days of Faculty Development Week.
   b. Let me know if you or someone in your Department is interested in attending any one of the above assessment conferences.

5. **Future Meeting Dates (2:30 - 3:30)**
   May 14

<u>REVISED - Minutes</u>

In attendance: Keenan Andrews (Research & Planning), Jennifer Asimow (Applied Science), George Bickford (Instruction), Sydney Daniels (English/Speech), Sammie Dortch (Applied Science), Jashed Fakhrid-Deen (Mathematics), Christine Franz (Instruction), Helene Gabelnick (Physical Science), Lynnel Kiely (Social Science), Cecilia L. Lopez (VP, Academic Affairs), Denise Maduli-Williams (Foreign Language/ESL), Willard Moody (English/Speech), Celia Perez (Library), Armen Sarrafian (Art), and Glenn Weller (CIS).

Absent: Uthman Erogbogbo (Biology), Thurman Gardner (Business), Bonnie Martinez (Business), and Paul Urbanick (Humanities).

Review Minutes/Notes of April 30th meeting
Please review minutes and forward any corrections to Angela Feliciano. Minutes will be posted on BBOC.

Discussions
- Critical Thinking (CT) Skills Rating Grid shows fairly significant agreement as to what CT skill categories are important for each department. We can use the grid to select a measure that comes closest and is most useful. We can also use the grid to develop a written statement to express what CT skills and competencies our students should be able to demonstrate.

- Three departments were ready to share their choices for the Critical Thinking measure they've selected.
  <u>Speech</u>: CCTT   <u>FL/ESL</u>: CCTT   <u>Applied Science</u>: CCTT

- Please get as many faculty members to take/review all three measures. Last day to submit recommendations for your department's choice for a CT measure will be 5/14/03 meeting.

- The CT measure we select will be sent to the publisher for scoring. The publisher will forward scores and a report that will provide comparable data to national cohorts. We might be able to request customized reports.

- Once we receive the CT report, the CT assessment data will be shared with the entire faculty, i.e. Faculty Council, Curriculum Planning Committee, etc. Faculty need to (a) review and interpret the information provided by the CT assessment data, (b) determine the data's implications for pedagogical, course, and/or curricular changes, if warranted, and (c) recommend changes that can be implemented to improve students' CT skills.

- Since VP López has not seen a great number of syllabi or course outlines that explicitly address Critical Thinking skills as part of the course, it may be difficult to motivate students to do their best on the CT measure faculty choose. Thus, it will be important to develop, over the summer, testing protocols that direct faculty members whose classes will be chosen to administer the CT measure to communicate the importance of critical thinking as part of

the course, the General Education transfer curriculum, and/or the AAS program they are teaching.

- **Comments from Committee members regarding the CT measures:**
  Speech: Are we testing for reading or Critical Thinking? Should we assume that after completing 32 credit hours our students are reading at the 12th grade level or higher? Any of the three measures will work for our purposes (CCTST, CCTT, WGCTA), but are we testing what it says we are testing? Additionally, we want to choose the test that can be administered in the shortest time so that students will actually read and answer the questions.
  FL/ESL: WGCTA directions are unnecessarily complex and difficult to understand or follow. Concerned about language used.
  Applied Science: WGCTA is too long and is complicated to comprehend. Every fifth question requires the test taker to learn a new set of instructions. The CCTT has not been updated since 1985.
  Physical Science: We need the answer key for the CCTST. Is there more than one answer to these questions? Item #17, for example, none of the answers are correct.
  IT (CIS): Faculty took two out of the three tests. Both were too long.
  Art: Interpretation is a skill category tested, but for art courses, Critical Thinking is not clearly tested.
- All six CT skills categories (interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, presenting arguments, and reflection) are not likely to be explicitly taught in every course in the curriculum. For any given course, typically one or two categories of CT skills may be explicitly addressed, but over an AAS program or the general education curriculum, all six CT skill categories should be explicitly addressed.
- We will not administer the CT measure every year. However, we will need to create an assessment calendar so that the CT measure is administered every two years.

- Last Committee meeting, members considered the following Pre- and Post- cohorts characteristics:
  - ✓ **Pre-test cohort:** **6-7 credits or fewer in general education**
  - ✓ **Post-test cohort:** **32 credits or more in general education**

  PROBLEM: The above effectively excludes vocational students since the AAS only requires 15-18 credits in general education. We can exclude this population or add a third cohort, i.e. 12-15 credits in general education.

ACTION ITEM:
- **Majority of the Committee members voted to INCLUDE vocational students because they will eventually transfer to a four-year school.**

- Committee members suggested that the Post- cohort be 45 credit hours total with at least 15 of those in general education credits. For next meeting, Committee members will vote on a rationale to include vocational students and if 45cr.hrs. / 15 GE cr. hrs. is appropriate.

Updates
- Information Literacy is not currently one of the seven GE skill categories. Glen Weller is working to see how it can be embedded into current GE goals. Glen will report next week.

- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) representatives will not be visiting HWC since the cost to host them is prohibitive. VP López will share a CCSSE PowerPoint presentation. If approved, CCSSE can be administered once every two or three years to students in all programs, including credit and continuing education.
- The Strategic Planning Committee and Keenan Andrews are reviewing USC's <u>Diversity Scoreboard</u>.

<u>Assessment Conferences</u>
- ❖ **June 22-24, 2003:** American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Assessment Conference, Seattle, WA
  Participants: Keenan Andrews and Glen Weller
- ❖ **July 26-29, 2003:** Council of the North Central Two-Year Colleges (CNCTYC) Summer Assessment Academy, Denver, CO
  Participants: Keenan Andrews and Denise Maduli-Williams
- ❖ **November 3-4, 2003:** Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN
  Participants:

> - Please let VP López know if you would like to attend any of the three conferences. Slots are limited for the Seattle and Denver conferences.
> - Faculty will be expected to share their conference learning/experiences with the Committee.

<u>ASSIGNMENT FOR 05/14/03 MEETING</u>
1) Decide on a measure for Critical Thinking:
  a) California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST); or
  b) Cornell Critical Thinking Test (CCTT); or
  c) Watson-Glacier Critical Thinking Appraisal (WGCTA)
2) Decide on characteristics and rationale for Pre- and Post- cohorts
  a) Pre: 6-7 credit hours or fewer in general education
  b) Post: 32 credit hours or more in general education, or
  c) Post: 45 total credit hours with 15 credit hours in general education.
3) Review the CCSSE measure and share with as many faculty in your department as possible.
4) Consider cross-disciplinary committees/team meetings for the first three days of Faculty Development Week.

 Meeting adjourned at 3:47 pm
Respectfully Submitted,
Angela M. Feliciano

<u>Handouts (List):</u> Assessment Resources
- *Critical Thinking Skills Ratings Grid*, compiled using information received from various departments.
- *The Community College Student Report 2003*, CCSSE, © 2003

NEXT MEETING:

WED., MAY 14, 2003 @ 2:30pm in CONFERENCE ROOM 1136

Assessment Committee
Agenda

5/14/03

1.   **Discussion**
         a. Departments' agreement on CT learning outcomes?
         b. Departments' agreement on which CT measure (CCTST, CCTT, WG) we
              should administer November 2003?
         c. Departments' agreement on characteristics and rationale for Pre- and Post
              cohorts?
         d. Is the CCSSE a useful instrument? Should we administer it Fall 2003?

2.   **Updates**
         a. Sub-committee on Information Literacy
         b. Diversity Scoreboard

3.   **Assessment Conferences**
         a. **June 22-24, 2003:** American Association of Higher Education (AAHE)
              Assessment Conference, Seattle, WA
         b. **July 26-29, 2003:** Council of North Central Two-Year Colleges
              (CNCTYC) Summer Assessment Academy, Denver, CO
         c. **November 3-4, 2003:** IUPUI Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, IN

4.   **Assignment for Summer 2003 and Fall 2003**
         a. Input and feedback will be needed during the summer.
         b. Consider joining/leading a cross-disciplinary team.
         c. Sign up to attend any one of the above assessment conferences.