

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

09-12-07

- Welcome back
- Humanities results and process analysis
- Spring NCA Presenting Humanities study
- 2007 - 2008 Assessment Plans
- Meeting time and location

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 09-19-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

9-12-07

**Members Attending**

Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Glenn Weller – CIS  
Lynnel Kiely- Social Science  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Chris Sabino - Mathematics  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Todd Heldt - Library

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Jennifer Asimow, Faculty Council  
Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Instruction  
Michal Eskayo – ESL  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Farrokh Asadi – Biology

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm in Room 1029 of Harold Washington College.

**1) Welcome Back**

This was Anita's first meeting as Chair and she welcomed everyone back to Assessment Committee.

**2) Humanities Results and Process Analysis**

Todd shared with us a handout which served to give an overview of information concerning the Humanities Assessment. Todd then summarized the content of the handout with the help of the other members of the Humanities subcommittee. The content of the handout is as follows with respect to the assessment: purpose, numbers and scoring, grading process, and general observations.

The sub-committee has been working with Keenan to analyze the results of the assessment. At this time, the time-line is unknown, but Dave said he'd reconnect with Keenan to determine an appropriate time-line. At this point in the meeting there was a lively discussion about whether or not the members of the subcommittee should be responsible for disseminating. In the end, Liliana suggested a hybrid group be formed. Todd motioned. Mike seconded and we

voted unanimously to accept. As an offshoot of this, Todd “volunteered” to chair this new sub-committee. Other members, thus far, include Tim, Willard and, likely, Mike.

## **2) Spring NCA Presenting Humanities study**

Anita posed the question of whether or not this sub-committee would like to speak at the upcoming NCA conference. Yet more lively discussion ensued and, in the end, the group was leaning toward presenting so long as they either had permission or involvement from Dave and Amanda Loos or merely gave credit where credit was due. There was no official motion to present and the sub-committee is still looking for other members to join.

## **3) Miscellaneous Business**

Given that this was the first meeting of the semester, we discussed our current membership. During this discussion, we realized we were lacking proper representation from a variety of departments. In the coming weeks, we will determine from which departments we need more participants.

## **4) 2007-2008 Assessment Plans**

This much anticipated topic began and ended with a discussion of what the GEMS sub-committee’s plans were. Dana explained that she had found a possible source of the Gen. Ed. Science Assessment from ACT. I added that we had been brainstorming a possible assessment similar, in nature, to the Humanities assessment. Glenn reminded us that there was a Science Assessment from 1998, which he would bring next meeting. In addition, Dana will talk to Cecilia or Amanda Loos to get contact information for an individual at Mesa. This individual’s ideas were extremely helpful in the development of our Humanities Assessment.

## **5) Indianapolis Assessment Institute/CHEA**

The committee spoke about who was going to the Assessment Institute. Next meeting, we will discuss this further. As for CHEA, the committee unanimously agreed that the Diversity Survey would be the obvious choice since it had already been presented, and there is a Diversity Committee here at HWC as a result. Anita will talk to Keenan about this.

## **6) Meeting Time and Location**

It was unanimously decided that we would continue to meet at 3:00 and, in doing so, change our location to room 1031, which has been reserved. Anita suggested we make this an abbreviated meeting. No one dissented.

**The Committee adjourned at 4:17 p.m.**

**Minutes Approved at the September 19, 2007 Assessment Committee Meeting.**

**Motion to approve proposed by Glenn and seconded by Dana**

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

09-19-07

- Approval of 9/12 minutes
- Review of ACT Math and Science Assessment tools
- Finalization of 2007/2008 Assessment schedule (i.e. develop math and science tools or use ACT tools)
- CHEA: Will Diversity Committee present?
- Open items and discussion

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 09-26-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

9-19-07

**Members Attending**

Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Glenn Weller – CIS  
Lynnel Kiely- Social Science  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Chris Sabino - Mathematics  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Barrington Edwards- Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Chao Lu – Mathematics

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Jennifer Asimow, Faculty Council  
Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Farrokh Asadi – Biology

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the meeting of 9-19-07. Secretary corrected the date prior to the meeting changes to Humanities tool would be added in appropriate section. Glenn proposed a motion to accept the minutes; Dana seconded the motion.

**2) Review of ACT Science and Math Assessment tools**

Dana shared her research of a possible General Education Science Assessment from ACT called CAAP(Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency) which is a 45 minute, multiple choice, pencil and paper test. Also, Dana e-mailed Cecilia about the MESA contact person and is awaiting a reply. Anita suggested that she might have assessment materials with that contact information. Dana will investigate this possibility before next week. We then discussed three possibilities for a Science assessment. 1. We create it ourselves

(similar to the one Glenn brought us from 1998). 2. We model an assessment after MESA's and 3. We use the CAAP. In the end, it was suggested by several people that we look at the Science general education requirements/SLO's and then make our decision. This will be our first order of business next week.

At this point there was much discussion concerning the implementation of such an assessment. There was discussion as to what the point of a pilot would be and, in the end, it was decided that if the science assessment was to happen, it would have to be around the week of November 5, leaving no time for a pilot most likely. This would be Assessment week. Also, efforts will be made by Dana to get a sample of the science CAAP for our perusal. Willard suggested we should take the exam ourselves to determine its usefulness. There was fairly widespread agreement on this point. Also, it was noted by Anita that Cecilia told her there would be funds for the CAAP. By the end of the discussion, it seemed the committee was leaning toward this assessment given the fact that it is multiple choice, is already created, from a reliable body (Mike), caters to HWC general education (Dana) and the data analysis is done for us.

As for Math, there was a very lively discussion regarding the math assessment. As a committee, we looked at what Dana provided from ACT. It was noted by the secretary that there was a College Algebra component, which could be troublesome given that HWC students do not need to take this course. (It doesn't transfer nor does it fulfill the Gen. Ed. Requirement.) The conversation then turned to the question of who would create the assessment and what type of assessment it would be. Barrington suggested that HWC faculty should create the assessment. We came to no conclusion. We did, however, decide that we would first need to examine the SLO's from the Math department. The secretary will bring these to next week's meeting.

The committee also examined a multiple-choice assessment for math versus one that required the students to show work. Chao explained that most math faculty do not use multiple-choice tests. Many of the questions asked of math students are "open ended" thus allowing creativity in responses. Jen, Carrie and others continued the discussion of right answers vs. process. In the end, there was no consensus as to what types of questions would be best. Yet again, we decided that upon viewing the SLO's, we would have a better idea. Glenn suggested we "table" our discussion of math until we finalize the science assessment. The committee unanimously agreed.

### **3) Finalization of 2007/2008 Assessment schedule**

As a result of the previous discussion, we decided to focus on Science (Assessment and Gen. Ed. Requirements) in the fall and Math in the spring.

### **4) CHEA: Will Diversity Committee (DC) present?**

Anita told the committee that the DC is interested and will probably apply. We will provide assistance. The DC will have a decision by Tues. Sept. 25.

**5) Assessment Institute in Indianapolis Nov. 4-6**

Cecilia has agreed to pay for AC members to attend this institute. As of yet, no AC member has committed to it though some are interested. Carrie suggested we ask Department Chairs if they would like to attend. The committee agreed this could be a good idea.

**6) Humanities Assessment Results Committee (HARC: my acronym)**

Todd updated the committee on recent progress of this new subcommittee. They will meet after this meeting and will report what they discussed at the next meeting. Todd spoke to CIS faculty about the information Matthew put into Excel. The subcommittee is hoping to make this information more accessible and useful for Keenan. Todd e-mailed Keenan and is awaiting a reply.

**The Committee adjourned at 3:58 p.m.**

**Minutes Approved at the \*\*\*\*\*, 2007 Assessment Committee Meeting.  
Motion to approve proposed by \*\*\* and seconded by \*\*\*\***

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

09-26-07

- Approval of 9/19 minutes
- Review and Discuss Science and Math Learning Outcomes
- ACT Assessment Tools Update---**Dana**
- Update on 2007/2008 AC Calendar
- Update on "HUMAS" Subcommittee---**Todd**  
(HUMAS is the committee that will analyze the results of the Humanities Assessment.)
- Subcommittee Work/Reassignment  
Marketing  
"HUMAS"  
GEMS

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 10-3-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031



Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

9-26-07

**Members Attending**

Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Glenn Weller – CIS  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Chris Sabino - Mathematics  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Chao Lu – Mathematics

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Jennifer Asimow, Faculty Council  
Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Lynnel Kiely- Social Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Farrokh Asadi – Biology

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 9-19-07 meeting. Glenn proposed a motion to accept the minutes; Mike seconded the motion.

**2) Review and discuss Science and Math Learning Outcomes**

Dana and the secretary e-mailed the Science Learning Outcomes and Math Learning Outcomes, respectively, prior to the meeting. Since we decided to look at math next semester, the committee focused on reviewing the General Education Science SLO's.

Dana noted that she and Liliana had worked on the SLO's last semester. They have yet to be approved by the committee. There was discussion about the wording of the outcomes, our ability to assess them and their seemingly empirical nature. The discussion focused around the idea of the SLO's addressing process (in the form of the Scientific method) as opposed to outcome (or an answer). In the end, there was no clear consensus other than for the GEMS

subcommittee to continue discussing and revising the SLO's. The committee looks forward to seeing what GEMS has come up with. These SLO's will be instrumental in the determination of an appropriate General Education Science Assessment.

### **3) ACT Assessment Tools Update**

Dana, with the help of Cecilia, requested the Science (and Math) module from ACT. We will have one week from the day we receive it to review it. ACT will send three copies of the modules for us to review. The committee agreed that this would be the main focus of our meeting next week, assuming we get the module by then. Barrington asked the committee what we're looking for in this assessment. His question led to a flurry of responses from the committee of useful criteria with which to review. The committee suggested the following criteria: relevance, usefulness, applicability to our students, relation to SLO's, and appropriate language. Dana will provide a list of criteria for the committee to consider when we review the assessment. To this end, Anita suggested we use the current SLO's since the approved ones are unlikely to deviate too much from them.

### **4) Update on 2007/2008 AC Calendar**

Anita reiterated that we will focus on science this semester and math next semester.

### **5) Update on "HUMAS" Subcommittee**

HUMAS has become the official name of the Humanities Assessment Results Committee. (*The most popular pronunciation is like the Mediterranean dip.*) Todd told the committee that they are still waiting for information/responses from a variety of sources but should have answers to their questions soon. Anita and Todd talked about a deadline for dissemination of the results. Mid to late October seemed to be the consensus though this will be determined by the expediency of the answers to the aforementioned questions.

### **6) Subcommittee Work**

#### **GEMS (Dana, Liliana, Carrie, Barrington, Glenn, Chao Lu, and Chris)**

As provided by Dana...

"In the GEMS subcommittee, we edited the learning outcomes and discussed formulating a list of topics to consider when reviewing the CAAP Gen Ed science and math assessment tools. Both of these will be emailed to the Assessment Committee next week, probably Tuesday."

#### **Marketing (Anita and Mike)**

The marketing subcommittee discussed the importance of putting out some data and findings from some of our assessment activities. This was an important element of our work that could provide a focus should the science assessment not go according to our ideal plan and timeline. Mike would revisit the Diversity Posters, which were unfinished business from last semester. We also wanted to circulate some data from the humanities assessment. We should think in terms of 1-pagers, posters and flyers. The Assessment Committee should have some

presence in the school newspaper. A suggested format for our material was: Definitions, Outcome, Process, Data & Change. We thought we should certainly have some material out in the college community by December.

**HUMAS (Todd, Tim, Willard, Matthew, Jen, Chris (special consult))**

HUMAS discussed strategies for reconciling those assessments for which no two graders were within two points of one another. Chris agreed to look at the discrepant cases and try to figure out a way to deal with them. In addition, the committee talked about their timeline in regards to dissemination of data.

**The Committee adjourned at 4:01 p.m.**

<p><b>Minutes Approved at the 10/3/07 Assessment Committee Meeting. Motion to approve proposed by Glenn and seconded by Mike.</b></p>
---

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

10-3-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Glenn Weller – CIS

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Jennifer Asimow, Faculty Council  
Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 9-26-07 meeting. Glenn motioned to accept the minutes; Mike seconded the motion.

**2) HUMAS**

Todd updated the committee on the status of the analysis and dissemination of Humanities Assessment data. Todd thanked Glenn for all of his hard work formatting the spreadsheet data. At this point, there are still some grading discrepancies that need to be reconciled. Todd and the rest of the subcommittee are making final pushes to get the data into a workable and complete form for Keenan by Oct. 10.

**3) CAAP Review**

Before our meeting, several committee members had the opportunity to review the CAAP General Education Science and Mathematics Assessments. Dana led a discussion of the assessment based upon the following questions.

- a) Does the test as a whole and the individual questions approach science as a process?*
- b) Do the test as a whole and the individual questions assess the learning outcomes we've written?*
- c) Do you think it can be taken during a normal class time (i.e. 1 hr 20 mins), also including an introductory part to look at attitudes toward science (like the humanities)?*
- d) Is it appropriate for our student population?*

With respect to the science assessment, the committee unanimously responded negatively to it. For instance, most agreed that the assessment, which is supposed to take 40 minutes, would take our students much longer. Several committee members took the assessment themselves and found that it took longer than 40 minutes. Also, although its description seemed to fit into our SLO schema, the assessment itself only addressed one of our four SLO's. In addition, the assessment seemed to be more of a test in test taking, critical thinking or reading comprehension. Though the reading level, according to Microsoft word, ranged from 10<sup>th</sup>- 12<sup>th</sup> grade, the committee still felt that the passages would prove difficult for our students. In addition, we didn't feel this tool fit our student population. Also, the committee agreed that test anxiety would affect our student's ability to succeed on this assessment. Dana pointed out that one of the passages contained diagrams and material that would not be addressed in the first two chemistry courses. This amount of course is more than is required for the Gen. Ed. Requirement.

The question was posed by Barrington as to whether there would still be value in this assessment. Carrie suggested that this could feasibly serve as a program/department assessment. As for assessing General Education science, this tool did not meet our needs, unfortunately. As a result, the GEMS subcommittee will work on customizing an assessment tool for the spring semester. In addition, GEMS has yet to finalize the Gen. Ed. Science SLO's. This will be another focus of GEMS this semester.

As for the Mathematics Assessment, although there are some good questions, overall it, yet again, does not meet our needs. In fact, it is somewhat of a moot point given the fact that the math SLO's have yet to be approved. Aside from the SLO's though, Chao and Chris agreed that the tool was "algebra heavy" and included material that only a small fraction of our students would see. In fact, a student placing into statistics would have seen very little of that material at HWC. For these reasons, and the overall difficulty of the assessment, the committee decided that the tool was not suitable. As a result, GEMS will also work on reviewing the SLO's provided by Art DiVito before finding or creating an assessment tool.

### **3) Assessment Week**

Anita asked what, then, we would do during assessment week without a science assessment. She suggested, along with others, that we revisit our previous assessments, advertise what we have done, disseminate the information and share what we have learned. Dave jokingly called it an Assessment Greatest Hits although we agreed that this very nicely summarizes our goals. By Assessment Week, HUMAS will have the data summarized and we will gather materials from past assessments and share them with the HWC community. The hope is that these efforts will help to facilitate programs and departmental efforts to create/modify their SLO's and assessments.

### **4) Miscellaneous**

In other news, Domenico Ferri from the Social Science department was welcomed to the committee. He "volunteered" to join the Marketing subcommittee. Given that all business had been discussed, Domenico motioned to adjourn and Carrie seconded.

**The Committee adjourned at 4:01 p.m.**

<p><b>Minutes Approved at the 10/10/07 Assessment Committee Meeting. Motion to approve proposed by Mike and seconded by Glenn.</b></p>
--

**AGENDA**

10-10-07

- I. Approval of 10/3 minutes
- II. Assessment Week
  - a) Review Previous Assessments/Results
  - b) Draft Assessment Week Schedule
  - c) Link previous assessment work to current program/departmental efforts
- III. Subcommittee Work
  - a) **HUMAS**: Continue analysis/compiling data
  - b) **Marketing**: Brainstorm ways to “package” Assessment Week
  - c) **GEMS**: Review Science and Math Gen. Ed. SLO’s and begin discussing Gen. Ed. Science survey/assessment

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 10-17-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

10-10-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics  
Glenn Weller – CIS

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Jennifer Asimow, Faculty Council  
Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 10-3-07 meeting. The secretary noted that Liliana had e-mailed some changes to the minutes. He paraphrased the changes to committee. Mike motioned to accept the minutes with the changes; Glenn seconded the motion.

**2) Assessment Week: Review Previous Assessments/Results**

Anita began by thanking Carrie for all of her hard work on last year's progress report. The appendix of the progress report summarizes the information and results from every assessment that has been done at HWC (with the exception of the recent Humanities Assessment) since 2003. This is a very valuable resource in our planning of assessment week. Given the value of this document, Anita



distributed copies for the committee to reference throughout the meeting. In addition to the progress report, Carrie noted that there is a CD with additional documents (i.e. minutes, agendas, newsletters, etc...) At this point, we reviewed the data from each of the assessments and discussed the highlights and each particular assessment's influence on HWC faculty, students and staff.

#### **a) CCTST**

Carrie noted, along with others, that as a result of the CCTST, that more faculty used the term 'critical thinking' than in prior semesters. The term appeared on a variety of syllabi thereafter. Also, Bloom's Taxonomy is present on many syllabi in the phrasing of SLO's.

#### **b) SAILS**

The insights from SAILS were that our students were better than the national average in most areas but found it difficult to distinguish credible/reliable sources from unreliable sources. This led to a great deal of conversation from the committee including a variety of stories about individual's first hand experience with this. As a result of the conversation, the committee proposed an Introduction to Library services workshop. This has been done in the past but not for a few years. Given that there are many new faculty, the time seems right. Todd said he will be glad to do this but must check on the feasibility/logistics of this with his department chair. Willard asked if this was intended for just faculty or all faculty, staff and students. The committee agreed that the workshop could be open to everyone. Mike suggested that a selling point for this would be for the workshop to provide faculty attendees with a conceptualized "quiz" for their subject area (i.e. a "real" scavenger hunt for them to provide to their students). As of yet, nothing is set in stone. The committee will revisit this later.

#### **c) CCSSE**

Anita asked if the information from the CCSSE was disseminated to the faculty. Jen told the committee that it was disseminated to faculty and staff via workshops. Since the CCSSE measures student happiness with service, there is no direct connection to SLO's. Nonetheless, the committee was curious if there was any valuable information to share from this assessment. An interesting observation of the data is that student perceptions and faculty perceptions of engagement were very different. We will use this information during assessment week in regard to this assessment.

#### **d) General Observations/Comments**

There were two threads of conversation with led to major results throughout the course of discussion of each assessment. First of all, after discussing the CCTST Jen suggested we create a glossary of assessment terms to be distributed to our faculty. This has been mentioned at previous meetings but given the recent summer seminars and upcoming Departmental assessment plans and accreditation, the sense of urgency is high. Jen reminded the committee that assessment vocabulary varies from institution to institution (CCC uses very specific assessment language which varies from other institutions, i.e. objectives vs. outcomes, etc...). As a result, we want all HWC faculty to be on the same page. This resource would be especially helpful to adjunct faculty and

to those who did not attend the summer seminar. It was suggested that this type of resource could conceivably be a part of a Adjunct Faculty or Faculty Handbook. Todd motioned for the committee to create and distribute this glossary of assessment terms. Carrie seconded the motion. The marketing committee will work on packaging this while other committee members will work on creating it.

Dave started the second thread of conversation. In reference to each assessment, Dave asked whether we should focus on our strengths or weaknesses. In other words, when disseminating the data, which is more important, strengths or weaknesses? Also, what's the point? How will we approach new data? Do we have a rationale? How do we go about change? Jen relayed to the committee that we try to make our data as transparent as possible and not "spin" it. Yet, still the question remained. What's the purpose? Carrie said that although we have shared the data from the assessments it has yet to be fully integrated. In other words, the feedback loop is not as strong as it could be. Thus, a goal is to close the feedback loop especially given the fact that it is culminated here at HWC with summer seminars, departmental assessments and accreditation. Carrie responded to Dave, and thus closed the discussion, by saying that we could approach previous and future assessment in a similar way as accreditation. We could use SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats). This would cover all bases and be unbiased.

At the very end of general committee time Anita suggested that Assessment week be the week of November 12<sup>th</sup> (the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of November). No one dissented.

The committee broke into subcommittees at 3:50.

#### **Marketing Subcommittee (Anita, Mike and Domenico) Notes from Mike**

The Marketing Subcommittee discussed what they wanted to present and 'package' to the college during assessment week. They felt it important to be clear about our audience and the 'what' and 'why' of anything we present. There was some discussion of the data and findings and how we could re-circulate and re-package this in other formats to have additional impact. The group felt we needed to be more clear about our role in the processes of change within the college. A good guide in this, with specific regard to faculty, would be to consistently ask the question, "How do Assessment Committee data and findings influence my evolution as a teacher?"

#### **GEMS Subcommittee (Dana, Liliana, Carrie, Chao, Glenn, Chris) Notes**

The GEMS Subcommittee discussed their timeline. They decided they would create a Science Assessment to be administered this spring and a Math Assessment for Fall 2008. The committee has been examining the Gen. Ed. Science SLO's via e-mail. This will continue and in two weeks, October 24, they will present them to the committee to vote on and, hopefully, approve. Once this occurs, the focus will shift to creating an assessment and examining the Gen. Ed. Math SLO's. The homework for each member of the subcommittee was to look at the Gen. Ed. Science objective and SLO's.

**HUMAS (Todd, Tim, Jen, Dave, Willard, Matthew) Notes**

The subcommittee discussed the scores of the assessment. There was a vigorous debate in regards to what kinds of reports Keenan should run.

**Minutes Approved at the 10/17/07 Assessment Committee Meeting.  
Motion to approve proposed by Tim and seconded by Chao.**

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

10-17-07

- I. Approval of 10/10 minutes
- II. Assessment Week
  - a) Discuss the Purpose of Assessment Week
  - b) Draft Assessment Week Schedule
  - c) Review 'draft' diversity posters
- III. Subcommittee Work (3:30-4:00)
  - HUMAS**
  - Marketing**
  - GEMS**

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 10-24-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

10-17-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics  
Glenn Weller – CIS

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Jennifer Asimow, Faculty Council  
Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 10-10-07 meeting. The HUMAS subcommittee will send their notes to the secretary. Given that, Tim motioned to accept the minutes; Chao seconded the motion.

**Assessment Week:**

Anita noted that we would review the Diversity Posters next week since Mike was sick and thus unable to bring them to the meeting. The general committee time was spent talking about the purpose and logistics of assessment week. As a result of the following discussion, many members agreed that it may be best to push Assessment week back a week or so in order to allow for more time to plan. This is not set in stone but will be considered next week.

The conversation began with a discussion of Dr. Lopez's recent presentation to the District department chairs of which she sent us the PowerPoint presentation as well as her glossary of assessment terms. The committee will make use of the glossary of terms during Assessment week. In addition, Glenn, Barrington and others noted that it could be worthwhile to have Cecilia speak during Assessment Week. Several committee members who have heard Cecilia speak on this issue agreed that her passion and knowledge of the subject could be a great start to assessment week. In particular, the reliance that assessment must be faculty driven (and not federally driven) is a theme we want to address during assessment week. This led to a discussion on selling points for assessment week which included the above theme but in a more dire/doomsday way (i.e. if we, the faculty, don't create our SLO's, who will?) Barrington thought we could, perhaps, enlist a member of the Art faculty to create a visual graphic. Several ideas were shared but nothing concrete came of it. We will further discuss these possibilities next week.

The committee brainstormed and discussed a variety of ideas for Assessment week, all of which in this paragraph are yet to be accepted. One idea was a panel discussion about the history and future of assessment locally and nationally. Another idea was to put up flyers with examples of "good" SLO's vs. "bad" SLO's. Yet another idea was to hold an Assessment info session for adjunct faculty. As a result of this conversation, several people inquired into whether adjuncts would be given compensation for attending such a session. Anita will ask George Bickford about this. In reference to the panel, the committee is leaning toward this idea but needs to figure out the logistics. These will be readdressed next week.

Dave suggested that assessment week could be the time to pique faculty interest in the value of assessment by showing them some of the results of our assessments, namely the most recent Humanities Assessment. He told the committee that MESA had funded faculty proposals related to investigating various assessment findings/results. Dave then shared some preliminary data from the student survey section of the Humanities survey. Some information, taken at face value, was very surprising for committee members. Jen and others noted, however, that the data might lie with respect to the population that was surveyed and suggested that we cross reference the data before making any assumptions. The committee agreed, and as a result of this discussion Todd motioned that we accept Dave's idea of presenting the Humanities Assessment data during assessment week for the purpose of getting faculty to brainstorm and possibly propose projects for the Humanities Assessment data (to possibly be funded pending approval). Glenn seconded the motion.

The committee broke into subcommittees at 3:37.

### **Marketing Subcommittee (Anita, Mike and Domenico) Notes**

The subcommittee brainstormed ways in which to best disseminate our assessment data. They will present their results to the committee in weeks to come.

**GEMS Subcommittee (Dana, Liliana, Carrie, Chao, Glenn, Chris) Notes**

The GEMS Subcommittee discussed Gen. Ed. Science SLO's. After a good deal of discussion, the subcommittee is ready to present a revised version to the committee for approval. Dana or Chris will e-mail the revised version before next week's meeting for the committee to peruse.

**HUMAS (Todd, Tim, Jen, Dave, Willard, Matthew) Notes from Todd**

All scores are correctly in the spreadsheet, and we are continuing to decide which reports should be run. Keenan has been extremely busy lately, so we have a little extra time to decide on these things. We always welcome suggestions.

**Minutes Approved at the 10/24/07 Assessment Committee Meeting.  
Motion to approve proposed by Dana and seconded by Tim.**



**Agenda**

10-24-07

1. Approval of Minutes for 10/17/07 meeting
2. Review and Discussion of Diversity Posters
3. Reconsidering timing of Assessment Week
4. Ideas for Assessment Week – for further discussion
  - Cecilia's presentation
  - Diversity Posters
  - Glossary of Assessment Terms
  - Panel Discussion on local/national history and future of assessment - logistics
  - Humanities Assessment Results – proposal for MESA
5. Sub Committee Work
  - Gems
  - Marketing
  - HUMAS

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

10-24-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics  
Glenn Weller – CIS

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences

Mike called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College and sent apologies from Anita. The secretary shared apologies from Liliana and Jenn.

1) Approval of Minutes

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 10-17-07 meeting. The Marketing subcommittee will send their notes to the secretary. Given that, Dana motioned to accept the minutes; Tim seconded the motion.

**Assessment Week:**

**Diversity Posters**

Mike posted and distributed the current posters displaying the diversity data. Mike and others noted that this was unfinished business from last semester which could prove valuable for assessment week. As always, a vigorous conversation about the posters ensued. In particular, Mike relayed last

semester's suggestion that the posters to be written in different languages and posted throughout HWC. Another suggestion was to redesign the poster altogether and change some of the wording. As a result, Mike will come back next meet with some alternative forms of the poster. Lynnel will check the data on the poster to make sure it is accurate. We will revisit this next week and finalize it.

### **Date for Assessment Week**

The committee discussed pushing assessment week back to the week of November 26th. Dave made a formal motion to have assessment week the week of November 26th. The group accepted this unanimously.

### **Logistics/Activities**

The remainder of the committee time was spent discussing the events that will occur during assessment week as well as the theme, audience and purpose. There were a variety of suggestions, though none are set in stone. For instance, Todd suggested we set up a kiosk of sorts to distribute assessment related materials such as the glossary that Cecilia provided. Dave suggested we expand posters to include assessment facts/terms. Also, at this point, Dave volunteered to be in charge of the Humanities Assessment Presentation (planning and logistics). Dana asked if there would be an Assessment Times for Assessment Week(AW). Barrington asked about the theme. This led to a long discussion. A possible theme that was mentioned was evidence and change. Tim thought we should focus on conveying our data and highlighting the changes that have occurred. Another suggestion was to create a poster that would lead people to the Humanities Presentation. (along the lines of, what happens next?) All in all, this meeting served as a brainstorming session for AW. There were a multitude of suggestions from several people, but in the end, nothing was set in stone. From our conversation, Mike noted that there were 4 aspects to AW thus far.

1. Humanities Presentation
2. Conversation about Humanities Assessment results
3. Dialogue/Round table with Cecilia (permission pending) about Evidence and Change
4. Posters

The committee agreed to firm up and put into writing these ideas next week. The meeting adjourned at 4:02.

<p><b>Minutes Approved at the 10/31/07 Assessment Committee Meeting. Motion to approve proposed by Willard and seconded by Chao.</b></p>
--

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

10-31-07

- I. Approval of 10/24 minutes
- II. Review and vote on Gen. Ed. Science Definitions, Objectives and Outcomes
- III. Assessment Week
  - a) Finalize Purpose
  - b) Finalize Theme
  - c) Finalize Audience
  - d) Finalize Activities
- IV. Assignment of AC members to Assessment Week Responsibilities/Activities

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 11-07-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

10-31-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics  
Glenn Weller – CIS

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College and Anita reiterated her apology for last week and told us about the Hospitality bridge program which was just launched.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 10-24-07 meeting. Prior to the meeting, Chao pointed out to the secretary that the date needed to be changed. Given that change, Willard motioned to accept the minutes; Chao seconded the motion.

**General Education Science Objectives and SLO's**

The GEMS subcommittee presented the revised Gen. Ed. Science Objectives and SLO's to the committee. There was some conversation about the wording of a few of the outcomes, specifically number 2. In the end, as a result of contributions from Dana, Tim, Carrie, Willard, and others, a new version of SLO 2 was proposed.

*Interpret and articulate scientific results that are presented in verbal, graphic and/or tabular form.*

Tim motioned to accept the entire document with this change, Mike secondly and the committee unanimously accepted. This resulted in applause and a sigh of relief from the GEMS subcommittee members.

### **Assessment Week**

Mike helped to facilitate discussion by providing the committee with a handout stating a tentative theme, purpose, audience and events for Assessment Week. The tentative theme/title was “Evidence and Change”. After some discussion, it was agreed not to use this title due to the implications it may have. Prior to the meeting, Dave e-mailed a PowerPoint proposal entitled “Whaddya know?” The committee responded positively to this title and, in the end, Carrie motioned to accept the title “Whaddya Know: Reflections on Assessment”. Mike seconded and the committee voted to approve unanimously.

The conversation then moved to the actual logistics of the week. Anita told the committee that she had reserved space Monday and Wednesday of Assessment week (11/26, 11/28). Next came Dave’s proposal that was mentioned earlier.

### **Dave’s Proposal**

Dave shared with the committee his vision for assessment week. The committee received this very well. Here is the text from the PowerPoint that encapsulates the proposal.

#### **Purpose—Disseminate findings; plant seeds**

#### **Purpose: Disseminate Info & Brainstorm**

Critical Thinking I & II

CCSSE

Information Literacy

Diversity Climate & Appreciation

Humanities Appreciation & Exam

(\$5000 Grant from Strategic Planning) Instruction—Related

#### **Theme—Dual meaning (staff/students; students/skills & content)**

#### **Theme: Whaddya Know?**

Emphasizes idea that Assessment = Information

Emphasizes idea of learning-centered approach

Sounds like a game show

Easy posters

#### **Audience—Entire HWC body**

#### **Audience: Everybody**

Students see institutional interest, gain info and ownership, invited into responding, have assumptions challenged.

Faculty/staff see institutional interest, gain info and ownership, invited into responding, have assumptions challenged.

**Means—Five information events highlighting six to ten strengths, two to 5 challenges discovered & brainstorming session to follow.**

**Means: 5 Sessions (or fewer combined)**

Same time, same place, all week (if possible)

Information Highlights

(with complete info available)

Brainstorming Session

Mini Workshop on Grant Proposal

### **Needs**

Room

Event Captains

Data Posters (Locke on board)

Event Awareness

Leslie/Assistant for Mini-Workshop

As was previously stated, this proposal was very well received but there were a few questions and comments. Mike asked what the faculty responsibilities/goals are. Dave said that this would relate to instruction and faculty could use this to make a connection to teaching. Also, faculty could submit a report on their findings. Mike said that this was a great way to “incentivize” people to look at assessments and contribute to change. This could also broaden the range of data and incorporate students. Carrie then mentioned that it would be important to include not only instruction but applying data and linking to what we’re doing here (i.e. Gen. Ed., etc...) at HWC. In addition, faculty could possibly create a report to be disseminated (i.e. writing about it, reflecting) that is not too strenuous. Mike added that the criteria should be that part of the funding be used to produce something for dissemination or the classroom.

Carrie added that we should be mindful of what the AC has already accomplished with respect to the assessments. Dave said we could provide highlights of data but make it all available to those interested in a specific project. At this point, Anita noted that there would be a need for 4 new subcommittees, Grant Guidelines, Marketing, Posters, and Workshops. It was agreed that members of GEMS be exempt of these new committees given the work they had to do in creating a assessment for next semester.

The committee broke into the new subcommittees at 3:48.

### **Grant Guidelines: (Tim and Todd) Notes from Tim**

The subcommittee will create Request For Proposals (RFP). It will discuss the purpose, guidelines and questions proposals should answer. They will have a rough draft done by next week.

### **Workshop Team: (Mike, Carrie & Barrington) Notes from Mike**

This is what we decided about the workshops during assessment week:

We should deliver 4 workshops in room 2003 from 3:00 pm to 4:00pm, one each on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday during Assessment Week.

#### **Monday November 26<sup>th</sup>**

Introductory Roundtable and Discussion on 'Assessment: The Bigger Picture' (is this the title?). Workshop led by Vice-President Lopez. This workshop should culminate in the offer of the \$5,000 incentive to faculty.

#### **Tuesday November 27<sup>th</sup>**

Critical Thinking Assessment – (needs a title)

Presentation of the Critical Thinking Assessment Data by Committee Members  
Discussion Groups – participants break into groups and dialogue created through key questions or other devices to support interaction, discussion and comment.  
Plenary Section – groups report back their key responses to the data and key questions.

The \$5,000 Incentive – Committee members present the opportunity for faculty and students to create a proposal for using assessment to improve student learning (clarify specifically the purpose of the grant).

How to get your hands on the money: the practicalities and logistics of the proposal process (forms, timescales, decision process, etc).

#### **Wednesday November 28<sup>th</sup>**

The Diversity and Humanities Assessment Data – (needs a title)

This workshop should follow the same format as the Tuesday workshop.

#### **Thursday November 29<sup>th</sup>**

The SALES (?) and CCSSE Assessment Data – (needs a title)

This workshop should follow the same format as the Tuesday workshop.

All data driven workshops should present key, interesting and challenging data selected to stimulate reaction and response. All workshops should point out to participants that full data can be provided for those who want to delve deeper.

### **GEMS (Chao, Chris, Dana, Glenn, Liliana) notes from secretary**

The subcommittee discussed possibilities for the Gen. Ed. Science Assessment. They looked at the newly approved Gen. Ed. Science SLO's in order to figure out what to assess and what types of questions to ask to assess them. This conversation will continue. In addition, the subcommittee agreed that the assessment should include a survey similar to that of the Humanities assessment and should take no more than an hour.

### **Poster (Dave, Matthew, Willard)**

The subcommittee looked over the data from the Humanities, CCSSE, SAILS and Critical Thinking assessment. The task was to come up with data ten points for each assessment to be shared within the subcommittee next meeting. These points will be used for the posters.



**Marketing (Anita, Domenico)**

The subcommittee discussed strategies to get the word out about assessment week.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01.

**Minutes Approved at the 11/7/07 Assessment Committee Meeting.  
Motion to approve proposed by Glenn and seconded by Todd.**

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

11-7-07

- I. Approval of 10/31 minutes
- II. Subcommittee Progress
  - Grant Subcommittee: Request for Proposals Document (Tim and Todd)
  
  - other news from subcommittees
- III. Subcommittee Work on Assessment Week and Gen. Ed. Science Assessment (GEMS)

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 11-14-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

11-7-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics  
Glenn Weller – CIS

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences

Mike called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College. He communicated Anita's regrets. Carrie also sent her regrets.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 10-24-07 meeting. Glenn moved to accept the minutes pending subcommittee notes from marketing and posters. Todd seconded.

**Request for Proposals (RFP) Draft: Tim**

Prior to the meeting, Tim e-mailed the draft of the RFP. Tim ran through the items on the RFP and asked the committee for its comments. For the most part, the committee felt the document was acceptable. There were some concerns however. Glenn, and several others, asked what the grant money could be used for. In other words, are there specific items it must be used for. Dave will ask Keenan for some clarification on this issue before next meeting. Also, Lynnel suggested that there be a place for applicants to prioritize the items that they are

budgeting. (For instance, if they are only given x dollars, which items will they fund and which will they abandon.) Another concern was that the RFP doesn't mention the "awardee's" responsibility to disseminate their results. Tim will add this to the modified document. Aside from these two concerns and some general discussion, the RFP was well received and the committee agreed to review the "final" draft and approve it at next week's meeting.

Out of our discussion of the RFP, Liliana asked if AC members could apply. This could be a conflict of interest depending upon the body evaluating the application. This led to a discussion of who would be in charge of deciding who gets the grants. Though not fully set in stone, there was general consensus that the grant approval committee's membership should include two members of AC (without a conflict of interest, i.e. detached from those applying), a member of Faculty Counsel (FC), Leslie Villasenor, and Keenan. Tim agreed to follow up on this issue. In addition, Lynnel suggested that a rubric should be created for "evaluating" the grant application. Todd agreed to create this rubric based upon the criteria set forth in the revised RFP. As soon as he completes this, he will share it with the committee.

### **Assessment Week (AW)**

At the beginning of the meeting Mike, after sharing Anita's regrets, shared information from Anita with respect to AW. She said that Cecilia confirmed for the Monday of AW. Also, Anita has reserved the rooms for AW each day.

After the discussion of the RFP closed, we were about to break into subcommittees when a new thread of conversation began. Glenn, and others, shared their concerns with the AW schedule. His main question was whether we would have the attendance we would hope for over four days. Could we change the schedule? The quick answer from Mike and others was that the days and rooms had already been set but there was flexibility in the content. The discussion continued and in the end the decision was deferred to the Workshop subcommittee. At the conclusion of this discussion, Willard asked when the HWC community would be notified of AW. The committee agreed that this should happen ASAP; Mike will check with Anita once the schedule is finalized so an e-mail blast can be sent.

The committee broke into subcommittees at 3:35.

### **Grant Guidelines: (Tim and Todd)**

Tim took the notes from the meeting and worked on editing the RFP. Todd began working on the rubric.

### **GEMS (Chao, Chris, Dana, Glenn, Liliana)**

The subcommittee continued discussing possibilities for the Gen. Ed. Science Assessment. Dana provided the subcommittee with a Gen. Ed. Science assessment from Mesa. We all agreed that it was not suitable for our students. As a result, however, we decided that our assessment should contain a graph, a table, a diagram and a paragraph each followed by 4 or 5 multiple choice questions. This would fully cover the SLO's in that these are the mediums by

which scientific data is presented, analyzed and disseminated. From here we decided that the table, diagram, paragraph and graph should address a specific topic from one area of a biological or physical science. This would ensure that the appropriate contextual bases were covered without bias toward a particular area. For homework, GEMS will search for graphs, tables, diagrams and paragraphs that are relevant, accessible and engaging from various biological and physical science areas. We will share our findings next week and, upon approval of a graph, table diagram or paragraph, begin creating the questions. We may also continue searching next week.

**Poster (Dave, Matthew, Willard)**

The subcommittee shared and reviewed the data points from the Humanities, CCSSE, SAILS and Critical Thinking assessment. Dave will format these into posters and send them out for review before next week.

**Communications (a combination of Marketing and Workshop)  
(Mike, Domenico, Lynnel, Barrington)**

There is general concern about how little time there is left before assessment week is upon us. The subcommittee is not clear about who is taking on this work. There should be an email blast to all announcing Assessment Week and the workshops we are offering. The titles we agreed on for each workshop were as follows:

Monday November 26th - 3pm

"Whaddya Know: Why care about assessment?"

A roundtable discussion with Cecilia Lopez exploring the bigger picture issues that impact HW's assessment work.

Tuesday November 27th - 3pm

"Whaddya Know: Critically thinking about critical thinking?"

Presentation of key data from the Critical Thinking Assessment - faculty discussion, ideas and proposal creation for learning improvement.

Wednesday November 28th - 3pm

"Whaddya Know: Assessing Diversity and the Humanities"

Presentation of key data from the Diversity and recent Humanities assessment - faculty discussion, ideas and proposal creation for learning improvement.

Thursday November 29th - 3pm

"Whaddya Know: Show me the Evidence"

Presentation of key data from the CCSSE and SAILS assessment - faculty discussion, ideas and proposal creation for learning improvement.

None of the above has been seen or approved by the larger committee.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01.

**Minutes Approved at the 11/14/07 Assessment Committee Meeting.  
Motion to approve proposed by Tim and seconded by Todd.**

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

11-14-07

- I. Approval of 11/7 minutes
- II. Review RFP (Tim)
- III. Allocate AW workshops captains
- IV. Review Workshop captain guidelines/bullet-points (Mike)
- V. Poster posters (floor sign-up)
- VI. Subcommittee Work

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 11-21-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

11-14-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics  
Glenn Weller – CIS

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science

Mike called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College. He assured us Anita was on her way.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 11-7-07 meeting. Tim moved to accept the minutes. Todd seconded.

**Request for Proposals (RFP) Draft: Tim/Todd**

Tim presented the revised forms that take into consideration the comments from last week's meeting. In addition to the RFP, the rubric was included on the back of the document. For the most part, the committee agreed with the changes and found the document to be satisfactory. The one sticking point is still how the money can be sent. Tim is awaiting a reply from Keenan for this answer. Mike suggested that we should attempt to make the funds as unrestricted as possible as to "stimulate creative responses" from faculty. The committee tacitly agreed



but in the end decided to table this discussion until we have the appropriate information. Thus the document will remain a draft until we finalize these details.

It should also be noted that the timeline was changed from the original RFP. The deadlines have been pushed up since the money must be used by Spring 2008. (This information comes as a result of an e-mail from Keenan prior to the meeting.) The new deadline is Friday December 14<sup>th</sup> and the decisions will be made by Friday December 21<sup>st</sup> so faculty can implement their plans in the Spring semester. On a somewhat related note, Leslie Villaseñor has agreed to be a part of the evaluation team. The rest of the evaluation team has yet to be selected although they would be required to work the week of December 17<sup>th</sup>.

### **Assessment Week (AW)**

#### **Posters**

Dave displayed various poster examples for our assessment data via a quick slideshow. The committee responded very well to this and thanked Dave for all of his hard work. Glenn proposed we accept the posters with appropriate editing. Mike seconded. The posters will be put up next week. In addition, they will serve as discussion points for each workshop in that they present our assessment data in an inquiring way and they will be, tentatively, made into PowerPoint documents. In addition, the committee worked out the logistics for posting the posters as well as the editing process so as to have the copies made by next week.

#### **Workshop Captains**

First of all, the committee decided that we would, indeed, have four days of workshops during assessment week. As such, four sets of captains were needed. They are as follows:

Monday: Cecilia's Discussion: Anita

Tuesday: Critical Thinking: Carrie and Dave

Wednesday: CCSSE and SAILS: Mike and Carrie/ Todd

Thursday: Humanities/Diversity: Dave and Tim/ Keenan and Sammie

Each captain will be given the appropriate data well in advance so as to be prepared for their workshop.

Next week, we will finalize the logistics for Assessment week.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

<p><b>Minutes Approved at the 11/21/07 Assessment Committee Meeting. Motion to approve proposed by Dana and seconded by Lynnel.</b></p>
---

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

11-21-07

- I. Approval of 11/14 minutes
- II. Posters
- III. Assessment Week: Final Thoughts

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 12-2-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031?

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

11-21-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Glenn Weller – CIS

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:09 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College.

**1) Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 11-14-07 meeting. Dana moved to accept the minutes. Lynnel seconded.

**Assessment Week (Loose Ends)**

1. It was brought to the attention of the committee that the Wednesday and Thursday sessions of AW were flipped on the first e-mail blast and some posters. Dave motioned to switch the events for Wednesday and Thursday as we had planned last week. Mike seconded and the committee approved the change. The change would be announced via another e-mail blast. It would also require some modifications of posters.

2. Dave passed out the AW packages, which will be given out during AW. Anita told the committee that she had printed Cecilia's presentation and glossary of assessment terms for AW. Dave created the PowerPoint slides that will be displayed on the big screen in the lobby and will send them to the committee for a final review before posting them.

3. Mike suggested that we make copies of a recent article from *Inside Higher Ed.* that gives a report of current developments with respect to the Spelling's commission. He, and the committee, agreed that this would be suitable for Cecilia's talk.

4. Posters were distributed to the committee for posting throughout the building.

**Request for Proposals: Tim**

Tim presented a revised version of the RFP. Tim received some clarification from Keenan in which she said that the money cannot be used for stipends. Also, it is preferred that individual don't use the grant money for equipment. Everything else is fair game, however.

The committee gave a round of applause to Dave and Tim for their hard work on AW. The meeting adjourned at 3:33 in order to give people time to post the flyers.

<p><b>Minutes Approved at the 12/5/07 Assessment Committee Meeting. Motion to approve proposed by Liliana and seconded by Chao.</b></p>
---

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

12-5-07

- I. Approval of 11/21 minutes
- II. Assessment Week
  - a) Summary/Report from Captains/Participants
  - b) Carrie's comments
  - c) Further Discussion
- III. What's next? (next meeting, next semester)
- IV. Subcommittees (re-establish)

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 09-26-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031

Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**Minutes**

12-5-07

**Members Attending**

Tim Donahue – English, Speech & Theater  
Barrington Edwards-Assoc. Dean of Inst.  
Domenico Ferri – Social Science  
Michael Heathfield - Applied Sciences  
Todd Heldt – Library  
Anita Kelley – Business  
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science  
Chao Lu – Mathematics  
Liliana Marin - Physical Science  
Willard Moody – English, Speech & Theater  
Carrie Nepstad – Applied Sciences  
Dana Perry – Physical Science  
Chris Sabino – Mathematics

**Advisors & Visitors Attending**

Matthew Williams, ESL Guest

**Absent**

Farrokh Asadi – Biology Department  
Louis Deiss – Biology Department  
Dave Richardson – Humanities  
Glenn Weller – CIS

Anita called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm in Room 1031 of Harold Washington College.

**Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed the minutes from the 11-14-07 meeting. Liliana moved to accept the minutes. Chao seconded.

**Assessment Week (AW) Introduction**

Anita began by giving thanks to all those committee members who helped AW run smoothly and who attended the workshops.

**AW Attendance:** The attendance for AW was as follows:

Monday 11/26 Cecilia's Discussion: 35 attendees  
Tuesday 11/27 Critical Thinking: 12 attendees  
Wednesday 11/28 CCSSE and SAILS: 16 attendees  
Thursday 11/29 Humanities/Diversity: 14 attendees

The audience for each day was a mix of faculty and students with a fairly large group from the committee.

### **AW Captain Comments/General Discussion**

**Monday :** The response to Cecilia's talk and the subsequent discussion was very positive. Anita felt that it was great and there was good interaction between the speaker and the audience. Carrie agreed and Mike said that the content and history was very engaging.

**Tuesday:** Carrie relayed that though the attendance was low, the conversation was valuable. Overall, she felt it went well. Some ideas that came from the discussion are as follows: 1) Mike Davis and Laura Chambers share an update on their project, 2) reanalyze the critical thinking data, 3) look at Brookfield's *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*, 4) look for new Critical thinking assessment, 5) implement a faculty training from a national figure for critical thinking skills (train the trainer model), 6) point faculty in the direction of literature on critical thinking and student learning 7) a practical handbook for students (on critical thinking)

**Wednesday:** Carrie said that Wednesday was a harder sell but overall went well. Some ideas that came from the discussion are as follows: 1) hold a library instruction session (make department or subject specific), 2) partner with tutors for increasing information literacy

**Thursday:** Todd said the audience was less engaged but still interested in the topic. By this point in the week, there were some people who had attended several days.

Carrie sent the committee an e-mail prior to the meeting which summed up a lot of the committee's sentiments with respect to AW. Overall, it was a success but given the time and extent of activities, the committee felt it could be even more successful. Also, we received one proposal, which will be reviewed via e-mail. If more come in, a select group of individuals will meet to decide who gets the grant.

Lynnel thought a hook for the week could be to focus the discussion on the classroom. Mike replied by saying that we have only used one method (workshop/meeting/discussion) to close the loop. He wondered how we could get more non-AC people involved. Todd suggested we have liaisons between the AC and department chairs. This led to a new strain of discussion.

### **AC Department Initiative**

Anita told the committee that in January the AC will begin sharing information with departments. This will require, as Todd suggested "pre-emptively", liaisons between the AC and department chair. The idea here is that we have done a good job trying to communicate with the general public at HWC but have not closed the loop with respect to individual department and department chairs. Carrie suggested we get the following items onto the agenda for a future chairs meeting: 1) AW findings, 2) presentations/data from AW, 3) invitation to share

with AC. The last item would a way to close the loop by inviting department chairs in. This will be a new direction for AC in which we take a role in advising departments with respect to their assessment and outcomes. As a result, the first item on the agenda for next semester will be to review our charge.

### **Closing the Loop (more)**

In our efforts to close the loop, committee members wondered what the role of Faculty Council and departments was. In addition, how can we be linked to other committees/entities (i.e. CAST, Departmental Assessment labs, Writing across the curriculum, etc...)? Can these groups come together for a dialogue to help proliferate connections and discourage separatism. (The idea here is that we are all in this together and often groups are working independently towards the same cause.) A suggestion was made to have a summit with a focus on more than just assessment (perhaps ideas for change). This will be discussed further later. Anita proposed that in January we have meeting with Barrington and Rosie: Departmental Assessment Labs and in February we meet with departments and chairs. Nothing was set in stone.

### **General Education Science Assessment**

Dana voiced some concerns about this assessment given the timeline and work left to do. GEMS (at least before AW) looked at a few assessments and discussed possibilities. We agreed that we should build upon the Humanities assessment model. Regardless, the science department needs to be involved. This brought up a logistics question in that there are really two departments. We are attempting to assess physical science and biological science but what about social science? Should that be included in our limited amount of time? The focus will be on the scientific method since this is the focus of the Gen. Ed. objective. The goal is to produce a quality assessment. GEMS will work hard from the onset next semester to determine the feasibility of creating such an assessment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

<p><b>Minutes Approved at the 12/12/07 Assessment Committee Meeting. Motion to approve proposed by Glenn and seconded by Mike.</b></p>
--



Harold Washington College  
Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – Anita Kelley, Business  
Committee Vice Chair – Mike Heathfield, Applied Science  
Committee Secretary – Chris Sabino, Mathematics

---

**AGENDA**

12-12-07

- I. Spring 2008 Plans
- II. Goodbye Glenn

The next AC meeting will be Wednesday 1-9-07 from 3-4pm in room 1031?