

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Tim Donahue, English

AGENDA
08/30/06

- Welcome back!
- Introduction of committee members – the old and the new
- Review of assessment - why are we here again?
- Proposed Calendar Revision
- Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges & Schools – Progress Report final due date, 11/30/06
- HWC Assessment Plan draft – Anita Kelley, AC Vice Chair
- Subcommittee work during meetings
- What are you interested in? What are your talents?
- Humanities assessment tool (survey and Power Point) – Amanda Loos, Humanities Dept.
- Minutes will be sent “request receipt”, please send changes via e-mail to Tim Donahue before the next meeting
- Look for new Assessment Blackboard site this week

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 09/06/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

**Assessment Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, August 30**

Attending

Jen Asimow, Applied Science
Tim Donahue, English, Speech & Theatre
Sammie Dortch, Applied Science
Anthony Ealey, Applied Science
Barrington Edwards, Associate Dean of Instruction
Todd Heldt, Library
Anita Kelley, Business/CIS
Lynnel Kiely, Social Science
Amanda Loos, Humanities
Denise Maduli-Williams, ESL/Foreign Languages
Liliana Marin, Physical Science
Willard Moody, English, Speech, and Theatre
Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Dana Perry, Physical Science
Dave Richardson, Humanities
Armen Sarrafian, Art
Glenn Weller, Business/CIS

Absent

(Since departments chairs are still in the process of naming and renaming faculty to the committee, it's not quite possible to list absent committee members.)

Meeting called to order at 3:00pm in room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Committee Nominations

- a) Carrie noted that she is still awaiting responses from department chairs regarding who will be nominated to represent each department on the Assessment Committee.

2) Why are we here?

- a) The committee discussed the various reasons we find working on the assessment committee to be meaningful. People offered the following reasons:
 - It's a chance to improve student learning.
 - There is consistently food, coffee, and timeliness.
 - We get things done.
 - There is a good, fun and productive group of people working on the committee.
 - This is a chance to collaborate and dialogue with faculty from other departments.

3) Proposed Calendar Revision

- a) Carrie explained the revision to the assessment calendar that she is proposing:
 - There will be no full-scale assessment in the fall.

- Instead, we will do a pilot version of the humanities assessment in the fall 06, receive some feedback from faculty, staff, and students, and then do a full scale humanities assessment in spring 06.
- b) The reason for this change has to do with a report due to the NCA this fall: During the last NCA visit, they commented on HWC's assessment program. HWC needed to write follow-up response explaining how our assessment program positively affects student learning. Dr. López asked for and received an extension on that report, and the extension deadline is Nov. 30, 2006. The Assessment Committee needs to be able to commit time to working on the NCA report this fall.
- c) Carrie also suggested that we form subcommittees which would work during the regular committee time on regular assessment issues.
- Willard asked how it would be possible for people to work on multiple subcommittees simultaneously.
- d) The committee discussed the proposed assessment calendar change; the following points were made:
- Tim asked what assessment we were planning on giving in the spring prior to considering changing the calendar; Carrie replied that the Math & Science Assessment was on the calendar.
 - Carrie noted that the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) has evolved so that they are now more evidence-focused. At present, HWC has lots of evidence regarding assessment's impact on student learning; we just need to pull it all together.
 - Sammie asked how much evidence of student learning we will have by the NCA visit in 2008.
 - Carrie replied that substantial evidence exists, but that more people need to be made aware of its existence.
 - Anita gave the refinements in the library's work and the seminars conducted via the Center for Teaching and Learning as examples of evidence.
 - Willard asked if we could use departmental assessment data as evidence to show learning gains.
 - Anita replied that we could; Willard noted that we can show an improvement in reading scores in recent years.
 - Jen noted that there is a large amount of unanalyzed data from assessments that have been completed twice.
 - Todd asked if other City Colleges do as much assessment work as we do.
 - The committee replied that most other colleges have assessment data, but lack the momentum of our committee.
 - Dana shared that Wright colleagues have completed some homemade assessments that HWC has not completed.
 - On a motion made by Sammie and seconded by Lynnel and others, the committee voted (all in favor with two abstentions) to administer a pilot Humanities Assessment in fall of 2006 and then administer a full-on Humanities Assessment in spring 2007.
 - Jen noted that this will leave us with one general education objective that was unassessed when the NA makes their site visit in 2008.
 - Tim asked if summer assessment was an option; it is not, due to substantially different student populations.

- Armen suggested that it would be preferable to have well thought out progress and plans during the NCA visit, rather than results which were gained when rushing to meet a deadline.
- Carrie underscored the importance to the college and the committee of completing the NCA report due in fall 2006.
- Todd asked who worked on assessment over the summer, and what was accomplished in their work.
 - Carrie clarified that Dr. López offered some stipends for individuals working on departmental assessment plans over the summer.
 - Barrington clarified that summer assessment work was not the same as summer work on the district's Curriculum Institute, which focused more on best practices than assessment. He will try to bring some of the institute's findings to the Assessment Committee.

4) Assessment Plan Draft

- a) Anita handed out drafts of the proposed assessment plan.
- b) Glenn noted that the college has had a plan in place in the past, but that the problem was that it was not consistent with what NCA wanted.
- c) Anita noted that before this October, we need to complete two more definitions of general education objectives. (We have five completed already.)
- d) Willard noted the absence of the English department in the Assessment Framework graphic.
- e) Anita asked that we approve an assessment plan by September 15; so we need to review the plan for next week.
- f) Sammie asked why departmental assessment was included under the Assessment Committee (in the Assessment Framework graphic on page 7).
 - The committee noted that the committee is not responsible for departmental assessment.
 - The visual must instead reflect that there is communication and dialogue, but not necessarily anything like supervision or oversight, between departmental assessment and the work of the assessment committee.
 - Armen suggested keeping departmental assessment in the graphic to convey our goal of collaboration, even if we're not there yet.
 - Jen noted that the assessment committee reports to the faculty council, but that the faculty council does not have oversight over the assessment committee in exactly the way implied by the graphic.
 - Anita asked the committee to e-mail her suggested changes to the document.

5) Brief Items

- a) Carrie asked the committee to think about how sub-committees might work as well as our potential interests in subcommittees.
- b) Carrie also suggested approving and revising meeting minutes via e-mail.
 - Tim asked if we could instead post minutes to the Assessment Committee's Blackboard site, and then discuss errors and changes on a Blackboard discussion forum.

6) Humanities Assessment

- a) Amanda showed the committee a draft of the written analysis component of the humanities assessment. The committee viewed the PowerPoint presentation students asking the assessment will view.
- b) Students actually taking the survey will have first completed an online survey via Surveymonkey, and will also have headphones to listen to musical selections.

Respectfully Submitted
Tim Donahue

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary –

AGENDA

09-20-06

3:00-3:10

- Review/approve minutes from last meeting
- Updates

3:10-3:30

- Subcommittee work
 1. NCA/HLC report
 2. Critical Thinking – comparative analysis
 3. Humanities – new tool
 4. Marketing/Investigators – newsletter, website, departments

3:30-3:50

- Large group review of subcommittee work
- Official notes for the minutes

3:50-4:00

- New business

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 09/27/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary –

AGENDA

09-13-06

3:00-3:10

- Review/approve minutes from last meeting
- Blackboard update
- Secretary update
- Membership update
- Definitions, Objectives and Learning Outcomes for the last three General Ed. Objectives

3:10-3:45

- Subcommittee work:
 1. NCA/HLC report
 2. Critical Thinking – comparative analysis
 3. Humanities – new tool
 4. Marketing/Investigators – newsletter, website, departments

3:45-4:00

- New business

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 09/20/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

**Assessment Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, September 13, 2006**

Attending

Jen Asimow, Applied Science
Rosie Banks, Interim Associate Dean of Instruction
Annie Behrus, Child Development/Erickson Institute
Tim Donahue, English Speech, and Theatre
Sammie Dortch, Applied Science
Barrington Edwards, Associate Dean of Instruction
Todd Heldt, Library
Anita Kelley, CIS/Business

Cecilia López, Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs
Denise Maduli-Williams, ESL/Foreign Languages
Liliana Marin, Physical Science
Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Dana Perry, Physical Science
Glenn Weller, CIS/Business

Absent

Anthony Ealey, Applied Science
Lynnel Kiely, Social Science
Willard Moody, English, Speech, and Theatre
Arment Sarrafian, Art Department

Meeting called to order at 3:00 in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of the Minutes

a)

2) Membership Update

- a) Carrie has asked the Dept. Chairs again for Assessment Committee members
- b) Some members have time conflicts
- c) Carrie will continue to pursue membership

3) NCA Report

- a) The committee needs to complete the work with the General Education Objectives by writing the remainder Student Learning Outcomes
- b) We have some that were written by the interdisciplinary groups
- c) We still need the Learning Outcomes which involve the Sciences
- d) Carrie would like us to think about these pieces and seek out the help of experts in those fields
- e) Cecilia reports that Art Divito worked on math outcomes for one semester
- f) The Committee needs to keep in mind that there is a difference between “computer literacy” and “information literacy”. So far, we have looked at information literacy with the SAILS survey.
- g) Dana reports that Chemistry has designed Student Learning Outcomes for one particular course
- h) Cecilia said that the interdisciplinary groups approach worked well with some objectives but didn’t work for others. Therefore, each department could come up with outcomes specific to that discipline
- i) Carrie thinks that the departments will need some guidelines/support in writing the Student Learning Outcomes
- j) Rosie suggested that a clearly written request could go to the departments
- k) Question – what is a reasonable deadline for a response from the departments, October 15?

- l) Carrie will call John Metoyer to get on the agenda for the Department Chairs meeting
 - a. Bio/Phys. Sci together – speak to chair
 - b. Math – speak to Art Divito

Discussion about subcommittee work

Dana expressed concern that official minutes were not being kept for each subcommittee and details of the work have not been recorded. Is this a concern for the committee?

There was general discussion about trying to keep better notes and taking more time after subcommittee work to give brief reports, which would then go on the official committee minutes. The subject was not voted on.

4) Subcommittees met for 20 minutes

- a) Critical Thinking – Weller, Dortch, Moody
 - a. The group had trouble interpreting the significance of the results of the 2006 CCTST
 - b. They decided to get a math teacher to interpret the statistics for us
 - c. The group decided that the assessment committee's report should compare the HWC's results of 2003 to the HWC results from 2006
 - d. They also decided to compare HWC's results from 2006 to the 2006 results from other colleges
- b) Humanities
 - a. They will shorten the introductory paragraph on the survey
 - b. We need to decide if we will do research to find correlations between class activities and student performance
 - c. We need to revisit how we allow students to select pieces to write about
 - d. They would like to do **small** samples this fall
- c) Report
 - a. Anita distributed an updated assessment plan
 - b. Rosie distributed a description of the history of assessment at HWC
 - c.
- d) Marketing

6) New Business

Anita has a version of the November report available for review; a further rewrite is forthcoming.

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary –

AGENDA

09-20-06

3:00-3:10

- Review/approve minutes from last meeting
- Updates

3:10-3:30

- Subcommittee work
 1. NCA/HLC report
 2. Critical Thinking – comparative analysis
 3. Humanities – new tool
 4. Marketing/Investigators – newsletter, website, departments

3:30-3:50

- Large group review of subcommittee work
- Official notes for the minutes

3:50-4:00

- New business

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 09/27/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

**Assessment Committee
Minutes
Wednesday September 20th 2006**

Attending

Dana Perry – Physical Sciences
Liliana Marin - Physical Sciences
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Jen Asimow – Applied Sciences
Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences
Anthony Ealey - Applied Sciences
Anita Kelley – CIS/Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Todd Heldt – Library
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean of Instruction
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages
Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences

Absent

Arment Sarrafian – Art
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Darrylann Tod – CDL
Chris Sabino – Mathematics Department

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:02pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College. It was noted that Michael Heathfield has taken over the role of secretary.

1) Approval of Minutes for September 13, 2006 meeting

These were not approved, since they were incomplete at this time.

2) General Updates

- Not everyone has been able to access Blackboard as yet – Carrie will follow up with Ephrem about this.
- Carrie is now on the agenda for the Chairs meeting of October 6th.
- Cecilia had forwarded a letter concerning the CHEA Award to see if the committee was interested in applying. Jen had looked in to this last year but decided it was too much work at the time. Carrie felt this might also be the case this year.
- Carrie noted she would raise Assessment Committee membership with the Chairs and that she believed she had recruited a statistician from the Mathematics Department - murmurs of approval.

- Barrington wanted to commend the Child Development Team from Applied Sciences who had just emerged from what had been a very successful and intensive national accreditation visit from NAEYC. Things looked positive and, if granted, we would be of the first community colleges to have a child development program approved in this way. General congratulations were expressed to all involved.
- Anita noted she has the materials with regard to the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis – committee members will be attending and presenting at this event.

4. The meeting broke into Sub-Committees at 3:10pm

NCL/HLC Report Sub-Committee – Rosie, Anita, Dana, Carrie & Mike

1. There was some discussion of where the ‘history’ section should go – in the report not the plan.
2. The group felt the whole committee should review and give feedback on the draft report.
3. Anita explained that the APSA’s were all left blank for individual departments to complete - each program must generate these.
4. Rosie noted the distinctions between programs and concentrations – and which must complete individual APSA’s.
5. The group was clear that APSA’s were at an institutional level assessing departmental programs, not student learning. These may have a very functional use for new and building programs, and while connected and relevant, they were not the core of what the committee was about.
6. It was felt very important to distinguish between Departmental Assessment plans and the APSA’s. It was decided we should leave the APSA’s out and it would be good to be clear in the report about the difference and distinctiveness of the Assessment Plans and the APSA’s.

Critical Thinking Sub-Committee – Willard, Sammie & Glen

1. The group noted that the test scores decreased slightly from the 2003 CCTST to the 2006 CCTST. It was felt a statistician was needed to interpret the significance of the decrease, as well as the meaning of other statistical data.
2. The group hoped to get from the testing organization a 2006 CCTST report, like the one received from the 2003 CCTST. The earlier report clearly analyzed the data according to gender, class, ethnicity, etc. The 2006 report was not easy for lay people to interpret.
3. We need a ‘guide’ two of the descriptive words on the 2006 results: ‘group’ and ‘class’.

Humanities Sub-Committee – Denise, Tim, Anthony, Todd, Dave & Jen

1. PowerPoint – Denise: texts must be visual while writing, Jen asked: should we hand out texts? Tim: Questions in answer booklet.
2. Anthony: attach a short demographic survey, use hard copies of poems.
3. Denise: picture in picture for questions
4. Tim: put texts on computer, put questions in answer booklet, how do we get the committee approve it? Denise/Jen: do we need a motion to the whole committee?
5. Questions for Committee:
 - a. How do we select a pilot group?
 - b. What changes need to be made to the instrument?

- c. How is the rubric designed?
6. Dave: we need to retain survey to assess 'appreciation' in General Education objectives.
7. Students should complete survey in
8. *We need a deadline*

5. Full Committee Feedback from Sub-Committees began at 3:43pm

- a) It was felt we really needed a statistician and some focus.
- b) Humanities sub requested a timeframe and asked how approval for subcommittee work would be approved. There was a sense that everyone did not want to repeat the process that was used over the diversity piece.
- c) Carrie asked for a formal proposal and when would it be best to do a pilot while aware of everyone's workloads.
- d) One body needs to approve the document but we do not have time for a lengthy process.
- e) Humanities group noted logistics was more about content, not about appreciation, and skills. They were looking for what could be cut out.
- f) Anita felt that sub-committees should be empowered to make decisions on their work.
- g) Anita proposed the motion that sub-committees should be empowered to make proposals on which the whole committee then votes.
- h) There was some general discussion of this – but no vote was taken.
- i) Sub-Committees provided feedback on their discussion today.
- j) Humanities felt sub-committee work could be circulated to all members and then returned with comments/bullet point reflections – which would then be processed by the sub-committee.
- k) It was suggested that Blackboard could be helpful in this process – materials could be posted and the online discussions and consultations take place. In this way the dialogue would be recorded for all to see. There was a discussion that time was still a major challenge for many.
- l) It was decided to try the 'Report Out – Bullet Point Reactions – Sub-Committee Response' method of full committee feedback and dialogue.

The Marketing Sub-Committee

- Would like to see a simple flow chart as a publicity piece for faculty. Some kind of 'logic model', which identified: problems – action – results.
- It was also suggested that the committee should have some input during professional development week – to raise Assessment Committee profile and generate a positive buzz.
- There was also a brief discussion of the need for a logo and a slogan.

The NCA/HLC Sub reported that we should distance ourselves from the APSA – to general agreement.

It was also reported that this sub would soon have something for the rest of the committee to comment on.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:56pm.

**Assessment Committee
Minutes
Wednesday October 4th 2006**

Members Attending	Advisors & Visitors Attending
Dana Perry – Physical Science Liliana Marin - Physical Science Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences Farrokh Asadi – Biology Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction Todd Heldt – Library Anita Kelley – Business Glenn Weller – CIS/Business Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages Dave Richardson – Humanities Chris Sabino - Mathematics	Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep. Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction Leela Miller – Social Sciences Adjunct

Absent

Anthony Ealey - Applied Sciences
 Armen Sarrafian – Art
 Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
 Les White – Social Science
 Darryl Todd - CDL

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:00pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes for September 20th 2006 meeting

Attendance corrections were noted. Motion to Approve – Todd. Seconded – Anita.
 The minutes were approved.

2) Notes from the Chair

- Carrie thanked those who had shown their concern and noted that in future the meeting would not be cancelled but that other officers were more than capable of running the scheduled meeting.
- Blackboard is now fully operational – with a discussion forum for each sub-committee
- Carrie, Anita, Rosie and Dana met with Cecilia to discuss the NCL/HLC Report.
 - This was very useful and considerable clarity was gained
 - The report is due November 30th
 - So the Assessment Sub-Committee deadline will be October 30th
 - Our view of the difference between the APSA and Assessment was confirmed
 - Cecilia suggested the Assessment Mini Survey could be used first with Assessment Committee members and then the wider college community
- Carrie will continue to give us updates and seek full approval before the appropriate deadlines.

- The Mini Survey and the NCL/HLC plan had also been circulated by email to all committee members.
- It is clear we need evidence that our assessment work has made a difference to student learning outcomes.
- Carrie meets with the Department Chairs on Friday to talk about general education learning outcomes and she asked for any additional issues we would like her to raise.
- Carrie had now also obtained copies of all Department Assessment Plans – there were some differences in all of these.

3. Feedback on Assessment Plan Draft

- Tim referred to Page 8 and asked if we could make the distinction between general education student learning outcomes (SLO's) and discipline specific student learning outcomes much clearer.
- Jen asked if we could also identify different levels and systems of assessment – rather than just the two we are concentrating on (e.g. classroom assessment). It was noted that the question 'How does this impact student learning?' is a good one to ask to find out if we are discussing 'assessment'.
- Rosie suggested we include a simple glossary of terms to help address these important distinctions – e.g. 'evaluation', 'classroom assessment', 'program assessment'.
- Sammie noted that also on Page 8 Mike Heathfield needed to be added to the list of Assessment Committee Officers.
- Anita noted that for all this to be done by the October 30th deadline responses to Carrie need to be soon so that the plan can be complete by October 15th.
- There was a general discussion about the Departmental Assessment Plans about where and how they fit into our report. It was noted that these were all quite different and their content was not the remit of this committee, nor was their absence or completion.
- Tim sought clarification on the Assessment Committee's role with Departmental Assessment plans.
- It was clarified that our charge is one of support not oversight. It was confirmed that these issues were the remit of Cecilia and the Department of Instruction.
- Denise wondered if the attached Departmental Assessment Plans could just be summarized as part of our report. Glen agreed that we should just summarize.
- Jen noted there was some overlap between general education SLO's and program specific SLO's. She felt the general education SLO's may be helpful in formulating program specific ones and that Departments could use the committee as support for working on these.
- Sammie noted that blank pages needed to be removed.
- Carrie thanked everyone for their feedback and asked that we continue to do this by email.

4. The Requirements of NCL

This question was raised and some committee members reflected on previous requirements and practices. Glen passed a precious copy of the actual 1996 report to Carrie and asked she take care with it.

5. Assessment Times Newsletter

Carrie confirmed this was bi-monthly and asked if the Marketing Sub-Committee wanted to use the next issue which was due some time in October. Although not wishing to represent the view of the whole sub-committee, Lynnel accepted that this would be useful as long as she could be helped in this task. It was suggested that some of the issues of clarity of terms, definitions, roles and responsibilities with regard to 'assessment' would be a good use of this newsletter. Lynnel also thought it would be useful to paint the 'broad picture' and history - especially helpful to the many new faculty.

Other content suggestions were: provide a 'Frequently Asked Questions' section and a possible restatement of the purpose and importance of assessment.

Jen noted that there was a much greater awareness of assessment across the college community but a broad range of responses to it – the newsletter would help with encouraging a more general buy-in to the work of the committee.

Rosie asked for people to email terms for definition to Lynnel – so she had some material to work with.

6. NCA/HLC Conference

Tim reported that he was working with Amanda (?) and Carrie to present a paper on our work at the Spring 2007 Conference. This would focus on the Humanities Assessment they were working on, which was seeking to assess both attitudes and knowledge. It was felt this was an interesting area and, while the proposal still needed some work, they hoped the paper would be accepted.

7. The meeting broke into Sub-Committees at 3:45pm

NCL/HLC Report Sub-Committee – Rosie, Anita, Dana, Carrie & Mike

1. There was considerable discussion of the Departmental Assessment Plans and how best to use these in our report. The very short timescale was a major concern as was asking the committee to approve a document that was not fully complete or had appendixes that were still works in progress.
2. The group decided a solution to these issues was to include in our plan the general guidance that was given to departments for the creation of their Assessment Plans. In our full report we could then include the Departmental Assessment Plans and refer to the process of their generation. In this way we could both meet our deadline and be coherent and responsive to issues that were within our remit.
3. Carrie will send a draft of the report to sub-committee members by Friday for comment.

Critical Thinking Sub-Committee – Willard, Sammie, Chris & Glen

Chris Sabino, from the mathematics department, is a new member of this sub-committee. He received from Glen Weller the statistics about the 2003 and 2006 Critical Thinking Skills Test. Chris will analyze the results for the sub-committee.

Humanities Sub-Committee – Denise, Tim, Todd, Dave & Jen

No notes were made during this brief conversation. Jen emailed notes to Lynnel about Assessment Times – included below.

Marketing Sub-Committee – Lynnel, Barrington, Liliana & Leela

The Sub-committee brainstormed ideas for the newsletter "Assessment Times": * Include features that highlight the difference between assessment & evaluation. * Provide a quiz for people to take and provide the answers on the opposite side. e.g. Assessment of student learning is the same as using tests and quizzes to measure student performance. True or False? * Quiz the readers on the results of the assessment findings to date. For example: "Indicate where HWC rated in information literacy compared to other community college students nationwide" Below Average / Average / Above Average * Interview two faculty members and have them "debate" the issue of assessment (pro and con). Include their pictures in the newsletters! * Feature a "FAQ" (frequently asked questions section). * Include the chart of the assessment activity to date, the assessments used and the future schedule. Highlight the results or implications of the findings. Note: Jen needs to provide us with the software that she has used for the Assessment Times.

Jen's e-mail response:

Jen designed the template in Microsoft publisher. She ordered it through IT. She imagines Ewa can get it for the Marketing Sub-Committee group and install it on a couple of computers. (Some folks already have this software). Before the 'times' is put on the website, each issue should be turned into a PDF. Jen hopes this helps with the new edition.

8. Full Committee Feedback from Sub-Committees

There was not enough time to hear feedback from sub-committees – all were reminded to provide Mike with any notes they may have and to be clear to identify participating group members.

Carrie thanked everyone for their contributions and reminded all to keep the feedback coming to her by email to allow her presence in the work of the sub-committees.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:00pm.

**Ammended as per committee 10/11/06. Motion to Approve Tim, Seconded Dana.
Mike Heathfield 10/12/06**

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes

10-11-06

Members Attending

Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean
Instruction
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – Business
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign
Languages
Chris Sabino - Mathematics
Anthony Ealey - Applied Sciences
Armen Sarrafian – Art

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences
Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction

Absent

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
Darryl Todd – CDL
Dave Richardson – Humanities

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:02pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College. Apologies from Carrie who was unable to attend.

1) Approval of Minutes for October 4th 2006 meeting

Corrections were noted. Motion to Approve with corrections – Tim. Seconded – Dana.
The minutes were approved.

2) Notes from the Chair – Prepared notes from Carrie read by Anita

- Carrie attended chairs meeting as planned: explained committee's work and gave brief description of Humanities pilot. Also offered our support to departments.
- Asked for help with general education objectives.
- Cecilia distributed 'Suggested Guidelines for a Plan to Assess Student Learning' and asked that departments have two measures/instruments with implementation plan by Spring 2007.
- Carrie currently only has departmental assessment plans from CIS and the Library.

- Preliminary results from The Mini Survey have been useful to Carrie – thanks to all those who responded.
- Distribution of copied book chapter ‘What is Assessment? Why Assess?’. Committee felt that a library copy of this would be adequate for those who wanted to read more.
- Newer Assessment Committee members wanted for more general assessment information. Carrie offered a meeting to meet this need at 4pm October 18th.

Members felt this would be useful.

- Carrie was concerned about timelines. Her suggestions were:
 - Marketing - work out an Assessment Times distribution schedule for the rest of the academic year - and choose a consistent schedule.
 - Carrie is planning to send a monthly assessment update from the Chair via e-mail to all HWC.
 - Humanities – we need to have the pilot done this semester – with additional suggestions as to sample etc.

There was considerable discussion of this suggestion. Some members expressed concern that we should do this well and appropriately and not be driven by the report deadlines. It was decided that the Humanities Sub-Committee would respond to this in full during their group meeting.

- Critical Thinking – she would like to see something like a flyer and perhaps a newsletter article about Critical Thinking before the end of the semester.

Willard and Chris thought this was possible but they were waiting comparative data from other 2-year institutions to complete this work.

- Assessment Plan and Progress Report – We have the obvious deadline of November 30. What we need to think about is when to present material to the committee for approval.

After some discussion it was decided the draft would be out to Committee members for pre-reading and responses by November 6th. These comments could then be discussed in full at the November 8th meeting. Changes and final draft could then be approved at the November 15th Assessment Committee meeting. It was suggested that the draft could also be concurrently reviewed by the Administration following this same timescale.

3) The group then broke into Sub-Committees

NCL/HLC Report Sub-Committee – Rosie, Anita, Dana, & Mike

1. The group had feedback copies from a number of key people. We discussed key issues from this feedback.
2. We needed some graphic help with the organizational chart – it failed to communicate the connections between the two sides of the chart. Dana agreed to address this with a paragraph giving practice examples of these connections in action. To insert Draft 7 Page 8 of 36.
3. Draft 7 Page 15 of 36 – this flow chart needed action verbs and it was suggested that the box at the bottom of the page did not connect with the flow chart – should it be removed?
4. Draft 7 Page 17 of 36 – ‘Student Engagement’ was listed in this table. It was not a ‘General Education Goal’ – need to change the box title or remove the item – it was not coherent.
5. Draft 7 Page 25 of 36 – Cecilia really did not like this – we have to address these concerns.
6. Draft 7 Page 21 of 36 – Dana is currently working on these gaps – he is talking to science and trying to work these out. It was suggested even the plan needed more detail that just ‘Under Development’. Dana, with Rosie’s help will try to get more information, specifics and dates to give more planning substance here. The agreed to get this information to Anita by Monday 15th October.

Critical Thinking Sub-Committee – Willard, Sammie, Chris & Glen

- 1. Chris will substitute the 2006 statistics for the 2003 statistics in the "Results of the California Critical Thinking Skills Test Administered Fall 2003 during Assessment Week" (the report the Assessment Committee distributed to the HWC community after the 2003 test).**
- 2. The sub-committee will ask Cecilia Lopez or Carrie Nepstad to ask Insight Assessment for the statistics for 2-year college students taking the CCTST in 2006. The 2006 report from Insight Assessment doesn't include these numbers.**
- 3. Willard will write the text for the 2006 report on the CCTST.**

Humanities Sub-Committee – Denise, Tim, Todd, Anthony & Jen

Can we create a strategic plan that explains how we are creating a product that satisfies NCA evaluations but doesn't require a complete pilot? Todd will work on this over this weekend.

Steps that must be taken:

1. Content of Survey and Committee approval
2. Technology of Survey implementation and Committee approval
3. Recheck Survey for errors
4. Content for essay *****
5. Technology involved in essay *****
6. Logistics of brochure
7. Revision of Rubric
8. Administrate
9. Scoring(?)
10. Revise

Fall 2006 pilot is impossible – we need a technology person and a humanities person – Faculty Administration?

Dates:

- 3rd week in spring 2007 – 2 class pilot
- 10/25/06 Survey content complete
- 11/01/06 Committee Approval of Survey
- 11/08/06 ***** content complete
- 11/15/06 Committee Approval of Technology
- 11/22/06 Terminology of Slides to tech person

Marketing Sub-Committee – Barrington, Liliana & Armen

The Sub-committee discussed ideas for the newsletter "Assessment Times". The marketing subcommittee agreed on taking out the first edition of the Newsletter at the end of October. We thought that apart from the letter from the president (you) we should include some FAQ about assessment, starting with the difference between assessment and evaluation. We also wanted to include in October's issue a quiz about assessment general knowledge 5 to 10 questions. We were aiming to have all the information for this issue by October 25th to be able to make it. Getting Microsoft publisher will not be a problem, and if there were a template we can use, certainly it would speed up the process.

For the following newsletter we should be able to include an interview and debate with two faculty members that have opposite point of view about the assessment process at HWC. Also, we should be able to present the statistics and analysis from the Critical Thinking Skills Test from 2003 and 2006, depending on how much time Chris need to process the data.

8. Full Committee Feedback from Sub-Committees – began at 4:56 p.m.

Anita brought the groups back together and each group gave very brief feedback to the full committee – detailed content of which is recorded above.

Anita asked for Motion to Adjourn – Rosie. Seconded - *****.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:00pm.

Attached to these minutes are:

1. Committee Chair full meeting notes for use of Vice-Chair.
2. The individual sub-committee minutes as later submitted to the secretary for inclusion.

1. AGENDA

10-11-06

3:00-3:30

- Review/approve minutes
- Chair Updates – Department Chairs meeting, departmental assessment plans, president's bulletin

I went to the Chairs meeting last Friday and talked with them about the committee's work and a brief description of the Humanities pilot for this semester. I also talked with them about the committee's relationship to the departments and the departmental assessment plans. I assured them that we are not the assessment police – we do not have that kind of authority. However, we can act as a support to the departments as they develop and implement their assessment plans and as they think about the institutional assessment data and how they might make use of that information.

I told them about the general education objectives that still need student learning outcomes and asked for their help. I also offered to come to their departments to talk with them about assessment at the institution and assessment at the departmental level.

Cecilia distributed a "Suggested Guidelines for a Plan to Assess Student Learning" (see handouts). The departments had been given a deadline of May 2006 to write their departmental mission statements, learning objectives, and student learning outcomes. Now, Cecilia has asked the departments to include assessment measures/instruments (one direct and one indirect), the methodology for data collection, and the implementation schedule. This should be completed by Spring 2007. Cecilia offered summer stipends for the departments to do pilots of the process.

As a follow-up to this meeting, I e-mailed the Chairs and asked them to send me an electronic copy of their departmental assessment plans as they currently stand. So far, I have CIS and the Library.

- Preliminary results from assessment mini-survey

This has been really useful to me as the new Chair. I appreciate that you took the time and in fact, there is still time for you to send your feedback in. I have put together the raw data for each question. I would like your permission to make copies of this for the committee. I mixed the answers up so that they remain anonymous. I think it would be interesting to read. I found the results both depressing and hopeful. Depressing in the sense that there is so much more for the committee to do to get information out to the HWC community and actually make some kind of difference. Hopeful in that many people feel like we have a baseline presence in the college and we just need to keep building on that.

The newer members of the committee were asking for more information about assessment in general. I would be happy to do an assessment orientation for anyone interested – next week at 4pm. Also, I made some copies (not the best copy job) of chapters from a very helpful book. If you find it interesting, perhaps we could ask Cecilia to purchase a copy for each of us.

- Timeline proposal

I sent out that memo last Saturday about each subcommittee setting timelines. I think each group should be able to do that. However, I will give you some ideas of what I think is needed in the next few weeks:

Marketing - I would like for us to work out an Assessment Times distribution schedule for the rest of the academic year. The group should choose a consistent schedule for example – the Times comes out on the third week of every other month (something like that)

I am also planning to send a monthly assessment update from the Chair via e-mail to all HWC.

Humanities – we need to have the pilot done this semester. I would like to report, in the Progress Report, that we have a set date. Or, if possible, it would be nice to have preliminary results from the pilot included in the report (due November 30). This is tight, but we need to move forward. I think a pilot can be as small as 10 students or as big as a few sections of classes. Because this is a general education measure, we should pilot this with students in non-humanities classes (unless you want to do a tiny comparison but it must be mixed).

Critical Thinking – the public wants to know! People have actually been asking me what the results were and how they compared to the first round. I would also like to see something come out like a flyer and perhaps a newsletter article about Critical Thinking before the end of the semester.

Assessment Plan and Progress Report – We have the obvious deadline of November 30. What we need to think about is when to present material to the committee for approval. I think we also need to think about the plan being more of a description of the process in general. Whereas, the Progress Report will include all of the details in terms of the specific measures, outcomes and what we did about the information, etc. We can talk more on Blackboard☺

- Subcommittee Updates – do groups need feedback from the committee, do we need to review plans, vote, etc.?

Please let me know when you are ready to present something to the group. I can distribute it, or post it on Blackboard for review prior to the voting meeting. In other words, people should read it prior to the meeting and come to *class* prepared to give feedback and hopefully vote.

3:30-3:45

- Subcommittee touch base (make plans for Blackboard work, consider reaching out to subject matter experts, what support do you need from the Assessment Committee Chair or from Administration, etc.)

1. NCA/HLC Report – assessment plan and progress report
2. Critical Thinking – comparative analysis, brochure, flyer
3. Humanities – Instrument, implementation plan, rubric
4. Marketing- Assessment Times, FAQs

3:45-4:00

- Wrap-up
- New business

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 10/18/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

2. Humanities Assessment Sub-Committee

- Jennifer Asimow
- Tim Donahue
- Anthony Ealey
- Todd Hedlt
- Denise Maduli-Williams

Plan for the Humanities Assessment Pilot Plan

So far this semester	Familiarized ourselves with the survey and essay (PPT) draft completed by Amanda Loos. Discussed and revised parts of the survey and essay.
October 25 th	Survey content complete.
October 30 th	Survey content sent via email to whole committee for review.
November 1 st	Survey content discussed and (hopefully) approved by whole committee. Final changes made, and given to tech-person to put on surveymonkey.
November 8 th	Begin review, discussion, and revision of content of PPT slides (essay section).
November 15 th	Tech-person has survey up and running on surveymonkey. Check for final editing and other mistakes.
November 22 nd	Essay section and PPT slides discussed and (hopefully) approved by whole committee. Final changes made, and given to tech-person to finish and revise the PPT.
November 29 th	Discussion and revision of scoring rubric for essay section.
December 5 th	Discussion of selection of sections, discussion of identifying and training of graders.
1 st & 2 nd week of Spring Semester	Identify and prep sections (and instructors) Identify and training of graders Create, revise, and send materials for photocopying (faculty and student information sheets, essay questions and any other handouts) Put survey and PPT on specific computers Reserve computer lab Schedule proctors
3 rd week of Spring semester	Administer Humanities Assessment Pilot
After . . .	Tech-person compile survey results Graders score essay sections Discuss results Revise assessment
Later . . .	Plan for full-blown Humanities Assessment

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes

10-18-06

Members Attending

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages
Chris Sabino - Mathematics
Armen Sarrafian – Art
Darryl Todd – CDL
Dave Richardson – Humanities

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences
Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction

Absent

Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences
Anthony Ealey - Applied Sciences
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:05pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes for October 11th 2006 meeting

Corrections were noted. Motion to Approve with corrections – Anita. Seconded – Todd.
The minutes were approved.

2) Notes from the Chair

- Assessment Times is now archived on Blackboard for our records.
- Carrie asked to maintain a presence in sub-committee business via the e-mail dialogue and through Blackboard.
- Shelby had provided all the President's (current and previous) communications relevant to assessment – these were now all archived, as were the previous Chair's extensive records and files.
- Carrie was also keeping track of the considerable time both she and the Vice Chair were putting into Assessment Committee work. As already approved, the committee would be submitting to Cecilia a request for release time for Spring 2007 for the Vice Chair.

There were no objections from the floor for this re-submission.

- Carrie distributed copies of the collated responses to the Assessment mini-survey. She noted that there seemed to be an awareness of the Committee's work but some concerns about how we utilize all the data we are now gathering. It was clear 'critical thinking' was a resonant theme. Carrie posed a number of questions about the perceptions, presence and profile of the Committee within the College generally.

Some discussion of this followed in which surmised that there was a generally positive view of the Committee while noting that staff, especially newer ones, may be more busy with their more pressing work needs rather than the broader systemic work that was the Committee's charge.

- Student Representative – it was announced that Vanisha Harris had expressed the desire to be the student representative on the Committee.

It was felt this was to be welcomed. It was noted that she was also an employee and member of Local 1708. Some discussion followed about whether Vanisha could or could not represent both interests. The approval process for a student representative was clear, but not that for Local 1708. Carrie would investigate these issues further and come back to the Committee with some solutions. Vanisha had already attended an 'Introduction the Assessment Committee' provided by Carrie which was also attended by Mike Heathfield and Liliana Marin. The Committee looked forward to Vanisha's contribution, whenever her representative status was resolved.

- TLTC had met and Dave had told them the Committee wanted to be involved. The TLTC meeting needed to be reconvened soon and this would be again pursued.

There was some general discussion of how professional development time would be handled in the spring.

From the floor:

Todd announced he had ordered for the library 3 copies of "Assessing College Students: A Common Sense Guide".

3) The group broke into Sub-Committees at 3:25 p.m.

NCL/HLC Report Sub-Committee – Carrie, Anita, Dana, & Mike

1. Anita had worked diligently to incorporate the additional work provided by both Dana and Rosie. She had reproduced enough copies of Draft 8 to circulate to the full Committee at this meeting. We were then on schedule for a full Committee discussion of the 'Plan' document.
2. Anita had inserted the phrase 'Graphic being revised by Art Department' for both charts now appearing on pages 9 and 13.
3. There was considerable discussion about how clearly these graphic elements represented exactly what we wished to communicate. A series of changes were agreed about wording, visuals and placement which Anita would pass the Art Department as they worked on these elements on our behalf.
4. Carrie asked Dana if she could write a small piece which explored a little more the development of the conceptual framework – Dana agreed to this.
5. The group asked Carrie how she was progressing with the work on the main report. Carrie was positive about progress on this, noting that she would appreciate help with 'fact-checking' on some sections. Willard was providing this service for the section on Critical Thinking.
6. Carrie felt confident the November 1st deadline would be met.

Marketing Sub-Committee – Barrington, Liliana & Armen

1. It was requested that the full Committee provide 'assessment questions and answers' for the next edition of Assessment Times. These should be emailed to Liliana by Friday 20th.
2. There was a need for a new slogan.
3. The group also requested that Carrie provide some questions and data from Committee Surveys (Critical Thinking, Diversity, Information Technology and Engagement) that could then be used to create some teaser content to tweak the interest of the reader.
4. The group identified their allocated roles and responsibilities: Barrington – Copy Editor, Armen – Graphic Designer (fall color 'tan') and, Liliana - Collector and Managing Editor. Liliana's email was provided so that she could receive all the requested copy.
5. Deadline for all information was October 25th and Assessment Times would appear October 31st.

Critical Thinking Sub-Committee – Willard, Sammie, Chris & Glen

1. The subcommittee decided that the statistical categories and charts that were shown in our 2003 CCTST report should be the same in our 2006 report.
2. The subcommittee wants the testing organization (Insight) to provide a glossary that explains the technical words in the organization's 2006 report. We especially want to know the meaning of the words "group" and "class."

Carrie would chase the missing comparative data.

Jen provided some responses from her previous experience and agreed to meet with the group at the end of the meeting to see if she could help clarify the use of these terms.

Humanities Sub-Committee – Denise, Tim, Todd, Dave & Jen

Dave reported back from this group that the text for the Humanities Survey questions would be emailed to Committee members before next week's meeting. These could then be discussed by the full Committee.

4. Full Committee Feedback from Sub-Committees – began at 3:50 p.m.

Carrie brought the groups back together and they gave feedback – detailed content of which is recorded above.

- Anita handed out copies of Draft 8 of the HWC Plan for Assessing Student Learning.
- Carrie requested that Committee members be aware of the bigger picture when all this work came up for review next week. The purpose of the full Committee discussion, review and decision-making was not to re-visit the detailed and excellent work the sub-committees had undertaken on our behalf, but to bring attention to broader issues, concerns and comments. All of our work was appreciated.

Meeting Adjourned at 4pm.

Minutes Approved at 11/01/06 meeting.

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

AGENDA

10-25-06

3:00-3:10

- Review/approve minutes
- Chair Updates – student representative, Critical Thinking - Insight Assessment, Marketing Q & A, contacted Art DeVito, Math/science SOLs, meeting w/John Taylor, Criterion Three and Assessment, and the Assessment Institute (critical thinking and diversity sessions).

3:10-3:30

- Assessment Plan Feedback
 1. Discussion of big ideas – deal breaker problems
 2. Turn in hard copies with detailed feedback (if applicable)
 3. Vote

3:30-3:45

- Humanities Instrument (survey portion) Feedback
 1. Discussion
 2. Vote

3:45 – 3:00

- Wrap-up session
 1. Team touch base
 2. Plans for next week – homework?

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 11/01/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes

10-25-06

Members Attending

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages
Chris Sabino - Mathematics
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences
Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction

Absent

Armen Sarrafian – Art
Darryl Todd – CDL
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:00pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Notes from the Chair

- Carrie had emailed Sandra Banyard about the proposed student representative to the committee and was still awaiting a response.

There was a small discussion of the thinking behind the history of this approval process as part of the charge of the committee.

- Carrie had spoken with Cecilia who had emailed Insight about the terminology used in the Critical Thinking report. This was still being chased.

There was discussion from the floor about the source of the report and whether we could identify the meaning of the terms in question. Mark Henschel was identified as the author. Jen and Carrie would look for some original copies of the actual tests, to help clarify use of terms. Carrie would see if Cecilia has an electronic copy of the report.

- Marketing: Carrie had sent some content suggestions to the Assessment Times team and reminded everyone to do the same.

Todd suggested we should explain the difference between assessment and evaluation and also how assessment links the NCA.

Sammie suggested the difference between student learning outcomes and objectives.

- Carrie had contacted the Art DeVito who worked with the Math Department on student learning outcomes. She will get a copy of these outcomes for everyone to review.
- We were all reminded of the John Taylor meeting on Friday and the importance to the committee. Jen and Carrrie would be spending more time with John on the day through their other roles on Criterion Committees and Faculty Council.
- A small group of committee members would be attending the Assessment Institute in Indiana over the weekend and into early next week. Sammie, Anita, Cecilia and Keenan would be presenting our work on diversity. Carrie was also attending a number of key workshops.
- Carrie announced Anthony Ealey had officially withdrawn from the committee.

2) Full Committee Review of the Harold Washington College Plan for Assessing Student Learning

This plan was a request of the last NCA visit. The committee was very positive about the plan and thought that it was generally a very good piece of work. There were a range of suggestions and edits.

Dave had already sent his suggestions to Anita and thought that any assessment results should not be part of the plan. He also wondered whether individual departments should be connected to specific general education outcomes. He also thought it would be good to have a simple list of tasks we had actually completed and those we are working on – in some ‘at-a-glance’ format.

It was noted this was covered elsewhere in the plan and Armen and the Art Department are working on the visuals which will also help communicate this.

Tim asked about page 23 and specific departmental assessments and where did the placement test fit in all of this. There was considerable discussion of whether the entry level and exit level paragraphs should be placed here. The general view was that these sections did not fit here.

Mike asked about the meaning of ‘on going’ in Chart Three page 15. Tim suggested that the pre and post test could replace ‘ongoing’ in the Measure Type column. It was noted that ‘ongoing’ is one word.

A number of typographical errors were noted – Carrie explained the whole document would be fully checked for these errors including the correct spelling of committee members’ names.

Rosie raised the question of the student representative name on page 7. There was a general discussion of representation, voting and non-voting members and whether actual names were important here. This was also covered on page 29. The general view was that names should not appear but the roles and representational status might be the most important.

Barrington thought the report was comprehensive.

It was suggested the committee vote on the document. Tim proposed a motion to accept the document with the suggestions and amendments made today. This was seconded by Lynnel. The committee voted unanimously to accept the motion.

3) Review of the Humanities Survey Draft

There was positive support for this work and considerable discussion about the following aspects of the questionnaire.

Rosie asked whether respondents in the race/ethnicity section could select 'prefer not to answer'. It was explained that these categories had to match categories used in registry – so that we could ensure a representative sample of the student body. There was considerable discussion on this point.

The other agreed changes were as follows:

- Change Cohorts in Q1 (Credit hours completed) to match those from Critical Thinking exam (0,1-15, 16-30, 31+)
- In Q1, change "course hours" to "credit hours"
- In Q2, change "how many courses have you taken" to "how many courses you have completed"
- In Q2, change categories to reflect question (0, 1-2, 3+)
- In Q4, change "race/ethnicity" to "race and/or ethnicity"
- In Q4, add category ("Hispanic/Latino/Chicano")
- In Q5, change "18-25" to "25 or under"
- On the second page, last question, change the question to "If you indicated one or more of the above, how many were new experiences for you? (If you did not indicate any, skip this question.)" and delete "N/A" category.

Dave asked if we were able to vote. Tim proposed the motion to accept the survey with the suggested changes and edits. Anita seconded the motion. The committee voted to accept the motion unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Minutes Amended and Approved at 11/01/06 meeting.

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

AGENDA

11-01-06

3:00-3:20

- Review/approve minutes for the past two weeks
- Student Representative – Vanisha Harris
- John Taylor's visit
- Assessment Institute in Indiana
- Assessment resources

3:20-3:45

- Humanities Survey
- Assessment Times

3:45 – 3:00

- Wrap-up session
 1. Team touch base
 2. Plans for next week – homework?

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 11/08/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes

11-01-06

Members Attending

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Chris Sabino - Mathematics
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Armen Sarrafian – Art
Louis Deiss – Biology Department for Farrokh Asadi

Absent

Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences
Darryl Todd – CDL
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction
Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.
Keenan L. Andrews

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:02pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the minutes from the meetings of 10-18-06 and 10-25-06. Todd proposed a motion to approve the minutes of 10-18-06, it was seconded by Anita. Committee approved the minutes of 10-18-06.

10-25-06 minutes - Glen noted corrections to page 2 – ‘Art Department’ should read ‘Art DiVito’.

Dana proposed a motion to approve with correction, seconded by Todd. Committee approved the minutes of 10-25-06.

2) Notes from the Chair

- Sandra Banyard had approved the student representative to the committee. Carrie would inform Vanisha Harris. This was warmly received by the committee.

- John Taylor visit. Carrie reported on the full day she had spent with John, along with others from the HW community. John made it known that he had viewed our assessment website and, that if this was representative of our work, we were well on track. This provided relief for many and confirmed that we had made considerable progress since 2003. John also offered to review our report before the due date, which was acknowledged as a significant support to our efforts.
- Jen noted that the website needed to be maintained and updated. This was our public face, as evidenced by John Taylor's comments. Carrie asked that we consider how this significant task could be accomplished. It was originally the remit of the marketing sub-committee. We will return to this in further meetings.
- The Assessment Institute in Indiana. Carrie gave considerable feedback on the highly successful presentation of the team from HW. We were ably represented by Carrie, Anita, Keenan, Sammie and Cecilia. The presentation on our diversity survey was very well received and the college has already received enquiries about its use elsewhere. We were happy for this to happen, with appropriate credit and contextualization by new users.
There was some discussion about how, in some aspects, HW's diversity work appeared more advanced than many organizations at the Institute. We should really consider publication of our survey and the process the committee had undertaken. This was a view shared by HW administration. A congratulatory email from Cecilia was read to the committee.
- Carrie displayed a range of books she had bought at the Institute and circulated a catalogue of relevant publications. Todd asked that requests for the library be coordinated in one order from committee members. Cecilia had already agreed to fund any appropriate purchases in this increasing literature relevant to our charge.

3. Humanities Survey

Keenan was in attendance and provided some very helpful suggestions to improve aspects of our survey.

- For questions 7 through 11 she suggested the scale be changed from a true/false continuum to an agree/disagree continuum. The committee agreed with this suggestion.
- There was some discussion about questions 11 and 12 and how to present these in a brief and coherent way. It was decided that a simple matrix in which the listed choices could be checked twice would suffice.
- She also made a number of suggestions about layout, graphics and technical issues, which would ease the data analysis process. All of these she had discussed with Dave to seek his approval. None of these changed the content or essence of our questions. There was general agreement about these suggestions.
- It was decided that the questionnaire would be a paper survey before the video/artifacts section.
- Keenan was thanked for her great work on our behalf and she noted that our diversity survey still contained a mass of data, which we had yet to fully explore. Louis suggested that this be done by emailing people spreadsheets from which they could pull what they specifically required. This was the common practice in biology – the suggestion was appreciated.

4. Assessment Times

- Armen had delivered copies of the draft to Applied Sciences for circulation to the committee. Amtrak crises and a full weekend of assessment work had intervened in the proper circulation of this draft. The committee considered the drafts that were available in the room.
- Barrington had already reviewed this draft and, as agreed, sent his edits to Armen.

- It was noted Anthony Ealey should be removed from the membership list and that there was still some graphic and layout work to be done.
- Armen noted that there were in fact too many Q & A suggestions from the committee – which was useful for the next edition. It was suggested that ‘Q & A’ be added to the text in this section.
- The committee thanked Armen for all his work on this and he confirmed he would make the adjustments immediately following the meeting. The fall color would be buff.

5. Assessment Report

Carrie would be circulating the full report to members very soon and asked that we all reviewed this and gave feedback both electronically and at the subsequent meetings.

6. New Business – Faculty Council

Jen noted she would present the Assessment Committee charge at the Faculty Council meeting of 11/9/06. This had not occurred before. There was some discussion of our relationship to the Faculty Council and whether it was of an advisory or approval nature. We were appreciative of their support in our current relationship. Jen would report back on this meeting and it was noted that our charge was to be renewed in the spring of 2007 – so this relationship discussion would be revisited.

7. New Business – Placement Test Student Guide

Todd noted that this was still a work in progress. He had identified some pre-existing materials that served this purpose. Todd had also begun to work again with someone in Registry on making this a reality.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

<p style="text-align: center;">Minutes amended as per Assessment Committee meeting of 11/08/06. Motion to Approve – Dana Seconded – Luis Approved.</p>

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes

11-08-06

Members Attending

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences
Louis Deiss – Biology Department for Farrokh Asadi

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences

Absent

Darryl Todd – CDL
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield- Applied Sciences
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Armen Sarrafian – Art
Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:15pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the minutes from the meetings of 11-01-06 minutes – The date on the minutes was wrong. It should be changed to 11-01-06. Art DiVito's name was misspelled in the minutes. Dana proposed a motion to approve with correction, seconded by Luis. Committee approved the minutes of 11-01-06.

2) HLC Progress Report

Carrie passed out copies of the HLC progress report and a letter detailing specific tasks for Assessment Committee team members. This letter is requesting input from several committee members. Discussion followed on specific sources of information for the report. Carrie will send the report draft to Cecilia López and John Taylor, Higher Learning Commission for their feedback. The

committee agreed with Carrie that all-important information should be in the body of the report with attachments to back up the points in the report. Carrie requested that the committee review the report and give her feedback with our names and title by Monday, November 13, 2006.

3) The Committee Sub teams

Time was offered for the sub teams to meet. There was low attendance at this meeting because committee members had other obligations, so the sub teams did not meet.

4) Humanities Assessment Tool

Discussion followed on possibility of piloting the Humanities Assessment Tool later this month. Not enough the Humanities sub team were present to confirm this pilot.

5) November 22 Meeting

Glen made a motion to cancel the meeting for Wednesday, November 22, the day before Thanksgiving. After discussion it was decided that if the committee approves the HLC report on November 15, then the November 22 meeting could be canceled. Todd seconded this motion. The motion was approved. Carrie will send an email to the committee informing them of this decision.

Anita made the motion that the meeting be adjourned early and Lynnel seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

**Minutes amended as per Assessment Committee meeting of 11/15/06.
Motion to Approve – Mike
Seconded – Chris
Approved.**

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

AGENDA

11-15-06

3:00-3:15

- Review/approve minutes
- Progress Report Completion Plan revised:

Wed. 11/15	Thur. 11/16	Fri. 11/17	Sun. 11/19	Mon. 11/20	Tues. 11/21
Committee turns in feedback by end of day today	Carrie works on revisions	Carrie works on revisions, and posts document on Blackboard	Committee votes on document via Blackboard	Carrie makes final changes	Document goes to print

- Send to John Taylor for feedback?

3:15-3:30

- Feedback on Progress Report
- Cover designs for Assessment Plan and Progress Report

3:30-3:55

- Humanities tool reviewed
- Vote

3:55-4:00

- New Business

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 11/29/06 from 3-4pm in room 1029

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes

11-15-06

Members Attending

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Chris Sabino - Mathematics
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences
Armen Sarrafian – Art
Louis Deiss – Biology Department
Vanisha Harris – Student Representative

Absent

Darryl Todd – CDL
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.
Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:07pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the minutes from the meeting of 11-08-06. It was noted Carrie's name needed correcting and the accent was missing on Cecilia's name. Mike proposed the motion to approve with corrections, it was seconded by Chris. Minutes approved.

2) Progress Report Completion Plan Revised

- The committee reviewed the schedule from Carrie and agreed to review the second draft as per the schedule, respond to Carrie and vote on line (via Blackboard) by Sunday. There was some discussion as to whether the system would be down over the weekend. It was decided that both Blackboard and email would be used. If necessary, the committee vote could be pushed to Monday. Carrie needed committee members to ensure they voted on the report draft.
- Glen proposed the motion to send the draft to John Taylor for comments – in the way he had offered. This was seconded by Tim. The committee voted unanimously to support this motion.

- Jen questioned whether the math and science learning outcomes were indicated as not formally approved through the committee. Committee members noted where this was noted in the report. Carrie suggested she would note committee approval dates where appropriate.
- Sammie asked about The Teaching, Learning, and Technology Center Committee and whether there should be a larger role noted in the report including their responsibility for delivering workshops on identified areas. Carrie felt this was important but had not got to this yet. Sammie and Carrie would work together to get this in place for the report.
- There was some discussion about the quality of the graphic on page 15. It had been scanned to meet the deadline; this was in progress and would be address in the final report. Armen agreed to deliver the quality version by November 17th.
- The committee discussed the cover of the report and wanted this also to appear as polished as possible – so that content and façade communicated quality. It was noted that the assistance of a graphic artist was available but needed to be asked for. Carrie will ask Cecilia about this, although deadlines may make this difficult to realize. Committee was concerned about giving yet more work to Armen.
- Carrie will repeat the email she sent asking specific questions of specific committee members – again responses required by the schedule outline in today’s agenda.
- There was some discussion about the location of the plan within the report. General agreement with Cecilia’s notion that critical issues should be in the report body, supportive material in appendix. Carrie was still deciding on some aspects of the plan location.
- Carrie thanked the committee for all their work on this – noting that this was a time of significant pressure for all those engaged in tenure portfolio production and review. It was noted it was not easy to also find time to allocate to this major piece of work from the Assessment Committee.

3. Humanities Survey – Section Two

The committee reviewed the paper booklet and the computer-based element of the humanities survey, in advance of the pilot process.

There was considerable discussion and debate about the on-screen instructions, the intention of the questioning, detailed wording/phrasing/layout/color schemes and likely student behavior in response to this creative tool. The specific changes, edits and recommendations from the committee were noted by Dave for action.

The committee commended the Humanities Sub-Committee for their sterling work on this – it was evident considerable time and effort had been invested in this task.

Armen proposed the motion that the committee accept this section of the survey, subject to sub-committee action and decisions on the issues raised today in full committee. Todd seconded this motion. Motion was approved unanimously.

Committee was reminded of the tasks required over the next few days and that, these being completed, the next meeting would be held 11/29/06.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Harold Washington College
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

AGENDA

11-29-06

- Review/approve minutes
- Progress Report
- Scientific Inquiry SLOs – Dana Perry and Liliana Marin
- Humanities – plans for the pilot, Dave Richardson
 - Getting the lab ready
 - Headphones
 - Printing
- Assessment Times – completion & delivery plan for December edition
- Subcommittee rotation –plans for next semester, new math/science group, shift committees, wandering minstrels?
- Group Work
- New Business

Assessment conferences:

10th Annual Community College Assessment Fair at Moraine Valley Community College in Palos Hills, Thursday March 2, 2006 (see attached).

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 12/06/06 from 3-4pm, **location TBA**

General Education Objectives for Natural Sciences

“To understand the major principles of the natural sciences and the application of the scientific method to biological, physical, and environmental systems.”

Definition

The Natural Sciences encompass the life sciences (Biology, Zoology, and Botany) and the physical sciences (Physics, Chemistry, and Earth Sciences - Geology, Meteorology Oceanography and Astronomy). The Scientific Method is the classic tool used to explore nature, and it is based on observations, predictions, experimental investigations, and theoretical explanations of natural phenomena. Application of the scientific method reveals patterns in the observed phenomena, which leads to the fundamental concepts, theories, and laws of the life and physical sciences.

Learning Outcomes

The student will be able to:

1. Demonstrate and apply an appropriate knowledge of the fundamental concepts and theories of one of the physical or life sciences.
2. Develop explanations and/or questions about observations of the natural environment.
3. Apply the scientific method to investigate problems in various disciplines.
4. Conduct simple scientific investigations using laboratory equipment and synthesize the experimental data into written results.
5. Interpret and present the results of scientific information and experimentation in verbal, graphic, or tabular form.
6. Evaluate the validity of scientific resources and scientific claims presented in the media.
7. Relate science to their daily lives and use their scientific knowledge to make responsible decisions.

Assessment Fair

10th Annual Community College Assessment Fair

October 1, 2005

Dear Colleague,

This letter announces the Tenth Annual Assessment Fair to be held on Thursday, March 2, 2006 at Moraine Valley Community College in Palos Hills.

We look forward to another conference of informative and useful presentations. Our keynote speaker will be Barbara Walvoord, Director of the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Notre Dame. Her keynote topic will be *Assessment: Keeping it simple, making it useful*. Dr. Walvoord is a nationally-recognized figure in the student assessment field and the author of the book *Effective Grading*.

Included with this letter are two forms: the [Registration Form](#) for attendees and the [Call for Proposals](#) for presentations at the Assessment Fair. You may copy this letter and forms as necessary, and distribute to appropriate faculty and staff involved in student assessment, research, and academic affairs.

The value of the Fair for attendees depends greatly on the quality and relevance of the presentations. The presentations are made by faculty members and other assessment leaders and practitioners from community colleges around the state. Please encourage those at your college who are involved significant student assessment work to develop and submit a presentation proposal to share their work at the Fair. The deadline for submission of proposals is December 15, 2005.

Registrants will receive complete Assessment Fair information in early 2006.

Sincerely,

David Deitemyer
Director of Academic Assessment

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes
11-29-06

Members Attending

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Chris Sabino - Mathematics
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Louis Deiss – Biology Department
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages

Absent

Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences
Armen Sarrafian – Art
Darryl Todd – CDL
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction
Vanisha Harris – Student Representative
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction
Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.
Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Carrie called the meeting to order at 3:00pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the minutes from the meeting of 11-08-06. Secretary noted detailed changes to Humanities tool would be added in appropriate section. Anita proposed a motion to accept with noted additions, Chris seconded the motion.

Progress Report

- Carrie noted the Assessment Report was completed and delivered to John Taylor one day early – a copy of the substantial report was displayed for all to see.
- Anita led a round of applause from the committee and thanks for all of Carrie's work on this. Carrie noted the many contributions and hard work of the committee members that had made this process a communal endeavor.

- It was also noted by the committee the significant contribution Cecilia had made to the final report and her personal investment of time and energy in supporting this important work on behalf of the college. Thanks were expressed for the diverse contributions including David in reprographics who also proof read the whole document before printing it.
- Carrie outlined possible next steps in response to the report. It was also noted this report would serve as a major piece of evidence for the Criterion Three Self-Study group.
- Carrie identified that locating all relevant data was a significant challenge and wondered if it should be part of our task to archive and organize all relevant college data, activity and artifacts concerning assessment. There was considerable discussion of the feasibility, appropriateness and actuality of this task. The general view was that though this was a daunting and complex task, it was probably necessary and appropriate for the committee to undertake it. This was an exploratory project that Carrie, Todd and Louis would initiate initially.

Scientific Inquiry SLOs – Dana Perry and Liliana Marin

This paper was presented and debated in some detail. Dana and Liliana noted the contributions of relevant department chairs in the creation of this document. The committee agreed the following changes:

1. Reorder the second sentence in the definition along the lines of ‘The natural sciences use the scientific method....’
2. Remove Learning Outcome One – this was more appropriate to the departmental and programmatic level assessment.
3. Learning Outcome Three – add ‘academic’ before ‘disciplines’ at the end of the statement.
4. Remove Learning Outcome Four – this was already covered in SLO Two and Five.
5. Change SLO Seven to ‘Apply the scientific method to make responsible decisions in their daily lives’.

It was also suggested that the ACT was looked at as a good example of a testing tool that really covered critical thinking well.

Marketing Sub-Committee

Carrie asked for an update on the progress on the remaining edition of the Assessment Times. It was reported this was in hand and content had already been planned. It was requested that it could be circulated to the committee before publication so that we could all contribute to the proof reading process.

Carrie noted some of the challenges in achieving full distribution to the whole college community and there was some discussion of how this could be best achieved. It was suggested we investigate how the President’s Bulletin is distributed – Carrie will follow on this with Dan Freitag.

Sub Committee Rotation

The work of the Report Committee was now complete – so members need to think about where they might want to spend their time. Work areas needing to be addressed (some of them):

- We needed more work on the science piece
- The Diversity data needed to be used and put out to the wider community
- The Critical Thinking data needed to be used and put out to the wider community

Humanities Tool Update

Todd asked the committee to review the list of tasks provided by Dave needed before we were ready to pilot the Humanities Survey. These tasks were:

1. Schedule a Lab
2. Install Pilot on computers to be used
3. Print the surveys
4. Print the Booklets
5. Apply labels (to keep booklets and surveys from same respondents linked)
6. Find enough headphones
7. Write up procedures for test administration
8. Letter of explanation for both teachers and students
9. Design focus group questions
10. Gather lists of participants and their teachers
11. Design grading rubric

Clarification was provided on the need for the focus group element. It was noted that a pilot with only 5 students would be acceptable but that we planned to use 2 sections which could deliver approximately 50 respondents. It was noted the grading rubric design did not need to take place before the pilot.

We would also take the assessment tool ourselves next week in committee – as long as enough headphones could be located in time. If this were not possible we would still complete the survey section alone.

The committee approved the list of tasks and was reminded to look out for notice of the location of the next meeting (12/06/06) – if all was in place for us to undertake the Humanities Assessment Tool.

Meeting closed at 4 p.m.

<p>Minutes Approved at Assessment Committee meeting of 12-06-06. Motion to approve – Glen. Motion seconded – Tim.</p>
--

Committee Chair – Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Committee Vice Chair – Anita Kelley, Business
Committee Secretary – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science

Minutes

12-06-06

Members Attending

Dana Perry – Physical Science
Liliana Marin - Physical Science
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater
Tim Donahue - English, Speech & Theater
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Anita Kelley – Business
Glenn Weller – CIS
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Louis Deiss – Biology Department
Vanisha Harris – Student Representative

Absent

Carrie Nepstad - Applied Sciences
Lynnel Kiely – Social Sciences
Armen Sarrafian – Art
Darryl Todd – CDL
Chris Sabino - Mathematics
Farrokh Asadi – Biology
Cecilia López – Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
Barrington Edwards – Associate Dean Instruction
Rosie Banks – Office of Instruction
Sammie Dortch - Applied Sciences
Denise Maduli-Williams – ESL/Foreign Languages

Advisors & Visitors Attending

Jen Asimow – Faculty Council Rep.
Tom Glatz – Disability Access Center

Carrie had emailed her apologies to the Committee in advance and Anita chaired the meeting which she called to order at 3:05pm in Room 404 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the minutes from the meeting of 11-29-06. Glenn proposed a motion to accept, Tim seconded the motion. Minutes approved.

Humanities Assessment Survey

The committee all completed both parts of the new humanities assessment tool in the computer lab which had been made ready for this.

Dave informed the committee that he had already done a pre-pilot with one of his classes – students generally took between 35 and 45 minutes to complete both sections of the tool. It was

noted that Question 9 of Section One (questionnaire) answers c + d were repeats. Also, there may be a missing row of bubbles for one of the questions in this section.

Tom Glatz – from the Disability Access Center - was also in attendance to review the tool and ascertain how the Humanities Assessment tool could be made accessible to the full Harold Washington College student body.

General Feedback on the experience of completing the assessment

- The computer start screen – this needed to say students should complete the paper questionnaire first.
- There was some discussion of the demographic labels with regard to race/ethnicity and the order in which these descriptors were placed. It was decided the Humanities sub committee would check these matched exactly the format and word order used on the diversity survey.
- The double negative questions annoyed a number of committee members, but they did ensure more careful and specific reading of questions. In this sense, as a methodological device, they worked.
- It was noted that in one of these questions the ‘not’ was italicized and the other was not. It was decided both ‘not’ references needed to be underlined (8c and 8e).
- The sub-committee explained that one hour twenty minutes would be allocated for pilot groups to undertake the survey – this would allow plenty of time for settling in, resolving questions, technical preparation etc.
- Space was noted as an issue – both for the writing/essay questions in Section Two and in Section One to follow from questions to answer bubbles. Dave would check if anything could be done about this with Keenan – it might be a machine reading issue. It was also an attempt to keep the tool brief.
- The purpose of question 7 was asked for. Dave explained that this would provide data that may prove useful at a later date. The question explored self-identification with certain labels associated with humanities skills and identities.
- The wording of question 11 was confusing to many. It was decided this might have been related to our view of the category choices – rather than the view when answered by students.
- There was a request to put line numbers on the poem in Section Two. This was rejected as a potential confusion for the reader.
- For most committee members the experience was an informative and positive one.

Assessment Times

Members discussed the pre-circulated text from Carrie, which would constitute the primary content of the final Assessment Times of the semester. Attention was drawn to where she had requested specific information from committee members.

There was some discussion of the Humanities Student Learning Outcomes. It was noted these were discussed and approved by the committee some time ago.

The seventh paragraph of page one of Carrie’s letter was amended as follows:

“It is an interesting tool as it includes a survey component and a short answer component in which students will choose to write about either a visual, poetic or musical work of art.”

New Sub-Committee Formation

Members were reminded that the Report sub was now disbanded and they would need to select and new group in which to work. It was asked whether the critical thinking sub committee should also be dissolved. It was suggested that after the production of their brochure this might be a good time to revisit the question.

Final 2006 Meeting

Members noted Carrie's provision of food for next week's meeting. A number of members, while appreciating the food offer, were concerned about the priority of grading finals. There was a motion to request that Carrie revisit the need for next week's meeting. Just over half of those in attendance supported this request.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

**Minutes Approved at the January 17th 2007 Assessment Committee Meeting.
Motion to Approve: Anita
Seconded: Chris**