Assessment Committee Meeting
Minutes
February 1, 2006

Attendees

Keenan Andrews, Assistant Dean, Research and Planning
Farrokh Asadi, Biology
Jennifer Asimow, Applied Science
Kate Connor, Child Development
Tim Donahue, English
Sammie Dortch, Applied Science
Anthony Ealey, Applied Science
Barrington Edwards, Interim Associate Dean of Instruction
Todd Heldt, Library
Helene Gabelnick, Physical Science
Anita Kelley, CIS/Business
Lynell Kiely, Social Science
Cecilia Lopéz, Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs
Jon Metoyer, Interim Associate Dean of Instruction
Jesus Miranda, Mathematics
Willard Moody, English
Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Dana Perry, Physical Science
Dave Richardson, Humanities
Armen Sarrafian, Art
Glenn Weller, CIS/Business
Les White, Social Science

Absent

Denise Maduli-Williams, Foreign Language/ESL
Brandon Taylor, CDL

Meeting convened at 3:00 in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1. Approval of Minutes

- The minutes from the meeting held January 25 were approved, with the correction of a typing error on pg. 2, on a motion made by Glenn Weller and seconded by Helen Gabelnick.

2. Distribution of *Assessment Times*

- One representative from each department took copies of the *Assessment Times* for each full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and staff member of their department.
- Jen Asimow noted a typing error in the document that will be corrected in future issues.

3. Diversity Task Force Report and Discussion

- Keenan Andrews and Jen Asimow gave a report on the work of the diversity task force. They explained that the Assessment Committee was to approve the four principles of diversity they developed, revise and approve the two learning outcomes they developed, and create one or two additional learning outcomes. The principles of diversity they presented were as follows:
    1. Perspective.
    2. Responsible Citizen.
    3. Commonality and Difference.
    4. Experience with Culture.
  The learning outcomes they presented were as follows:
    1. Students will have a raised awareness of responsible citizenship.
    2. Students will develop their own personal perspective of human diversity.
    3. TBA
    4. TBA
- The committee had a discussion of the proposed learning outcomes in which the following points were made:
    o Glenn Weller asked what the relationship between human diversity and outcome #1 was.
    o Jen Asimow suggested that as we develop additional learning outcomes we use language which reflects high levels of Bloom's taxonomy, such as "internalize" and "raised awareness."
    o Glenn Weller notedthat learning outcome #1 is problematic because it is value neutral.
    o Sammie Dortch asked if reordering the learning outcomes could make learning outcome #1 less value neutral, and thus less problematic. However, Jen Asimow reminded the committee that learning outcomes should have meaning independent of one another.
    o Anthony Ealey suggested that we base outcomes on concepts such as "expanding" and "broadening."
    o Lynell Kiely noted that since the principles are arranged according to cognitive, psychosocial, and behavioral domains, along with actually having experiences, perhaps the learning outcomes should follow that pattern. In this case, the final learning outcome should refer to real opportunities to use skills and knowledge relating to diversity.
        ▪ Jen Asimow noted that she would prefer to see learning outcomes focused on internalizing knowledge, rather than solely using it.
    o Barrington Edwards explained that the principles intentionally relied on open-ended and non-specific language.
    o Carrie Nepstad noted that the principles and learning outcomes were a pair analogous to learning objectives and learning outcomes.
    o Barrington Edwards suggested that we need language to reflect advancement of beliefs, rather than value-based appraisals of beliefs.
    o Lynell Kiely suggested creating an outcome based on students' ability to compare perspectives on race and ethnicity.

- o Tim Donahue suggested rewording learning outcome #1 as follows: "Students' perspectives on human diversity will evolve."
  - ▪ Cecilia Lopéz noted that this is worded as an objective, not a learning outcome.
- o Carrie Nepstad suggested rewording learning outcome #1 as follows: "Students will be able to articulate the evolution of their perspectives on diversity." She also noted that knowing one's own perspective and comparing perspectives are not synonymous.
- o Jen Asimow suggested tabling the discussion of the learning outcomes at present so the committee members could have more time to revise and reword the learning outcomes before then next meeting.
- The committee moved the discussion towards the proposed principles, and the following points were made:
  - o Glenn noted that he felt the principles, as written, were too vague and should be expressed in a phrase or sentence.
  - o Todd Heldt suggested rewording the principles as follows:
    1. Have a broad perspective of diversity.
    2. Be responsible citizens in a diverse world.
    3. Understand commonality and difference.
    4. Have direct and indirect experiences with various cultures.
  - o Jen Asimow and Carrie Nepstad asked if we should rename these ideas objectives or goals instead of principles.
  - o Cecilia Lopéz affirmed that the "principles" were not actually principles, but objectives.
  - o The committee decided to rename the principles "Specific Diversity Objectives," because they are engaged in fleshing out the general education objective regarding diversity.
  - o Armen suggested tabling this matter until the following meeting.

4. CCSEE Brochure
- Cecilia Lopéz shared that the brochure distributed last week was of high quality. At this point, though, there was no other feedback on the brochure.

5. California Critical Thinking Skills Test
- Cecilia Lopéz noted that the sooner she could be informed of which sections have been volunteered, the sooner she could get the information to Antonio Gutierrez, and the sooner the listings with students' name, ID number, and credit hours could be completed.
- Armen Sarrafian passed around copies of the art to be used on four posters and 100 flyers to advertise the critical thinking assessment. Anita Kelley made a motion to accept and use the art, and the motion passed.
- Jen Asimow informed the committee that she had ordered 250 buttons to help publicize this assessment.
- Jen Asimow reviewed the process used to gather student information on this assessment: Antonio Gutierrez will create a listing for each participating section

with students' name, ID number, and credit hours completed; faculty will then check the students' data as they complete and turn in the assessment.

6. CCSEE Information Dissemination

- The committee is still considering how to publicize the general CCSEE results (not just the faculty results).
- Armen Sarrafian posed the question: What do we want this document to do?
- Jen Asimow asked if we should select information to publicize beyond the statistically significant differences already noted on the survey results.
- Dave Richardson suggested creating a listing that described ten areas in which we scored above average, ten areas in which we scored average, and ten areas in which we scored below average. This information sheet could then be distributed to faculty via the department chair.
- Armen Sarrafian suggested distributing this listing in a department meeting, and using that time as a chance to solicit faculty thoughts on the possible causes of the results, and strategies for improving in areas in which we scored below average.
- Carrie Nepstad reminded the committee that we need to distribute information regarding the assessment results to not only faculty, but also to students. As such, it is important to consider our audiences as we craft the information fact sheet.
- Glenn asked why it was necessary to publicize the areas in which we scored average.
  - Several committee members noted that this was an important category to consider because it named areas in which it will be easy to become excellent.
- Dave Richardson suggested holding student focus groups that would provide an opportunity to solicit student feedback on the survey.
- Jen Asimow raised the question of how we could also distribute information to and solicit feedback and strategies from the college's support staff.
  - Cecilia López stated that when considering below average scores in academic advising/planning (question 13-a), we should keep in mind that this refers to faculty advising, not advising received via student support services.
  - Jen Asimow and Helene Gabelnick stated that when students took the test, they were likely not thinking that the question referred to advising received from faculty, because they don't think of office hours as advising time.
  - John Metoyer clarified that faculty should try to advertise office hours as advising time.
  - Armen suggested that non-academic departments could receive this information and provide feedback and suggestions at any of their regularly scheduled department meetings.
- Glenn Weller considered the possibility that a discussion of survey results may not be well received in an academic department meeting.
- Lynell Kiely questioned why faculty needed to analyze data already analyzed by the assessment committee.

- o Jen Asimow clarified that the information was not to be analyzed, but should be used to consider possible causes and propose solutions to below average areas.
- Cecilia Lopéz affirmed that this strategy of departmental discussions could be very useful in generating new strategies.
- Helene Gabelnick noted that in the Physical Science department, the faculty could generate helpful ideas if the discussion were structured properly.
- Cecilia Lopéz noted that the next department chairs meeting is coming up on this Friday, February 3.
- Dave Richardson said that assessment committee members at the department chairs meeting could explain this strategy to other department chairs, before the actual departmental discussions of CCSEE will take place.
- Jen Asimow will type lists of positive, average, and negative results from CCSEE for the department chairs meeting.

Respectfully Submitted
Tim Donahue

Assessment Committee
Agenda
3/22/06
3:00-4:00- ROOM 1029

1. Approval of minutes from 3/15/06.

2. The upcoming student focus groups on customer service.

3. Human Diversity Learning Outcomes –

4. Sub-Committee Reports
    - Web site development – John Metoyer
    - Conceptual Framework – Dana Perry
    - Communications/Advertisement – Armen Sarrafian
    - Departmental Assessment Plans – Cecilia Lopez

7. New Business
8. Adjourn

The next meeting of the Assessment Committee will be at 3 PM
Wednesday, March 29, 2006 in RM. 1029

Note: In the next two weeks the committee will be taking nominations for Chair
and Co-Chair for AY 2006-2007.

Assessment Committee Meeting
Minutes
Wednesday, March 22, 2006

Attending
Jen Asimow, Applied Science
Kate Connor, Child Development
Tim Donahue, English
Sammie Dortch, Applied Science
Anthony Ealey, Applied Science
Barrington Edwards, Interim Associate Dean of Instruction
Todd Heldt, Library
Helene Gabelnick, Physical Science
Anita Kelley, CIS/Business
Lynell Kiely, Social Science
Cecilia López, Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs
Denise Maduli-Williams, ESL/Foreign Languages
Jesus Miranda, Mathematics
Willard Moody, English
Carrie Nepstad, Applied Science
Dana Perry, Physical Science
Dave Richardson, Humanities
Armen Sarrafian, Art
Les White, Social Science

Absent
Keenan Andrews, Assistant Dean, Research and Planning
Farrokh Asadi, Biology
John Metoyer, Interim Associate Dean of Instruction
Camelia Salajean, Mathematics
Brandon Taylor, CDL
Glenn Weller, CIS/Business

Meeting convened at 3:05 in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

1) Approval of Minutes from March 15, 2006
    A. Jen noted that she found out that professionals of the 1708 and 1600 unions prefer to be referred to as "professional and clerical staff." This change in terms is to be made throughout the charge and past minutes.
    B. The minutes were approved unanimously on a motion made by Dana and seconded by Lynell.

2) Discussion of Upcoming Student Focus Groups on Customer Service
    A. Jen and Dana suggested that we think about student focus groups given the recent article in *The Herald.*
    B. Jen asked how the campus could not have been aware of student dissatisfaction prior to the publication of *The Herald* editorial when the CCSSE indicated the same trends.

C. Cecilia responded by noting that Brandon Pendleton was tasked with creating focus groups, and that data from the CCSSE will be combined with data from the focus groups. She suggested a subcommittee from the Assessment Committee be formed and charged with helping to combine the two data sets and speaking for the Assessment Committee in the focus groups.
D. Jen asked what the questions to be discussed in the focus group will be.
   1. Barrington explained that the questions are still being formulated.
   2. Cecilia shared that the Administrative Council has seen an early draft of the questions, and that she will forward the final copy to the Assessment Committee when it is completed.
E. Helene noted that George Bickford's work on registration is closely related to the Assessment Committee's work.
   1. Jen said that she will forward meeting minutes to George.
F. Jen asked why all this work on registration issues is not being coordinated, particularly when the Assessment Committee has been saying such work was necessary for a while.
   1. Cecilia replied that the Administration has actually been working with the CCSSE data for a while, but the faculty still need to discuss the CCSSE data
G. Jen confirmed that the sub-committee from the Assessment Committee was to work with Brandon Pendleton on focus groups.

3) Discussion of Human Diversity Learning Outcomes
A. Jen handed out a list of thirteen possible learning outcomes for the committee to review, revise, and discuss.
B. Willard suggested that #10 be reworded as "suggest resolutions" instead of "resolve."
C. Jen reminded us that we should be open minded about how these outcomes will be measured across the campus.
D. Jen also noted that we need to trim this list of 13 outcomes down to 4-5.
E. Todd noted that outcome #13 sounded problematic.
   1. Willard noted that the "the" in #13 should be changed to "a."
   2. Denise noted that #13 is strikingly similar to #2, and that it is quite difficult to define what an educated person is.
F. Jen suggested that we strike #7.
G. Lynell asked why #1 refers to "questions," and that we should include issues, opinions, and behaviors in addition to questions.
   1. Carrie noted that "issues" refers to all the above ideas.
H. Armen noted that #5 is not measurable and should be eliminated.
I. Lynell asked if we could add "behavior" to "thinking and communicating" in #2.
   1. Willard suggested the use of "interacting" here.
   2. Barrington suggested that what we are really interested in are perspectives.
   3. Anita asked how it is that we measure thinking.
      i. Jen responded that we can do so with surveys.
   4. Armen suggested considering #2 in terms of thinking (a theoretical component) and interacting (a practical component).
   5. Barrington suggested replacing "different" with "multiple" or "variable."
   6. Tim asked if we wanted to "recognize and respect that there are multiple ways of thinking…" rather than "recognize and respect multiple ways of thinking.

> i. The committee as a whole preferred "various" to multiple or different.
7. Anita suggested eliminating some outcomes first and word-smithing them second.
8. Les suggested eliminating #2 because its ideas were present throughout the remaining outcomes.
> i. Carrie argued that #2 was unique because it engaged awareness.

J. Helene noted that #6 should be eliminated.
  1. Denise agreed that #6 should be eliminated, particularly if we can refine #2.
K. Jen suggested eliminating #8.
L. Cecilia suggested combining #2 and #9 as, "Identify multiple ways of thinking, communicating, and interacting by working with towards a larger goal."
  1. Armen suggested qualifying the second part of this sentence with "for example."
  2. Jen added that we should change the verb from "identify" to "identify and respect."
  3. The reworded outcome would appear as follows: "Identify and respect that there are various ways of thinking, communicating, and interacting, for example, by working with culturally diverse groups towards a larger goal."
M. The committee decided to keep #1.
N. The committee decided to keep the revised version of #2.
O. The committee felt that #3 had good content and problematic grammar.
  1. Cecilia suggested replacing identify with evaluate.
P. Barrington suggested avoiding the phrase "democratic process" in #4 because it has become buzzword which is missing content in our contemporary culture.
Q. Todd asked how #3 relates to the mission of the college.
  1. Cecilia suggested including structures along with perspectives, principles and systems.
R. Armen suggested changing ethical to intellectual in #3.
  1. This change will be further discussed in the next meeting.
S. On a motion made by Tim and seconded by Willard, the committee unanimously agreed to accept outcome #1: "Analyze contemporary multicultural, global, and international issues."
T. On a motion made by Armen and seconded by Willard, the committee unanimously agreed to accept outcome #2: ""Identify and respect that there are various ways of thinking, communicating, and interacting, for example, by working with culturally diverse groups towards a larger goal."

4) New Business
  A. Dana suggested including a thought provoking statistic from the CCSSE in each issue of the *Assessment Times*.
  B. The committee will take nominations over the next two weeks for the chair and the sub-chair elections.

Respectfully Submitted
Tim Donahue

Assessment Committee
Agenda
3/29/06
3:00-4:00- ROOM 1029

1. Approval of minutes from 3/22/06.

2. Proposal for release time

3. Proposed Assessment Calendar – Hand-out and Discussion

4. Human Diversity Learning Outcomes

5. Nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair – Academic Year 2006-2007.

6. Sub-Committee Reports
    - Web site development – John Metoyer
    - Conceptual Framework – Dana Perry
    - Communications/Advertisement – Armen Sarrafian
    - Departmental Assessment Plans – Cecilia Lopez

7. New Business
8. Adjourn

The next meeting of the Assessment Committee will be at 3 PM
Wednesday April 5, 2006 in RM. 1029

Note: If nominations are not heard at the 3/29/06 meeting, they will be heard at
the 4/5/06 meeting.