

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

1-27-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
John Kieraldo – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Charles McSweeney -- Advising
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Willard Moody – English
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Matthew Williams – ESL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Chris Kabir -- Office of Research & Planning
Maggie Taylor – Library Intern

Absent

Michael called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm in Room 1040 of Harold Washington College. Prior to the meeting, the AC reviewed the meeting minutes from 12/2 Maggie motioned to approve the 12/2 minutes; Todd seconded.

QR Assessment

Chris and Jeff told the AC that the grading is nearly done. It will likely be completed by the end of next week. Chao, Chris, Jeff and Kurt worked on grading the almost 1200 assessment during the break. Overall, it was a smooth process. Once the grading is completed, Mike will requisition some people to scan. A crucial question came up during the discussion. For the open-ended questions, how do we differentiate those who didn't answer the question from those who received 0 points due to incorrectness? The committee will troubleshoot this. Tentatively and conditionally, Chris will create headline findings from the assessment for Assessment Week (Week 12).

Key things this semester

Effective Writing: The subcommittee has finalized the rubric to score a writing assessment. The outcomes need to be finalized and approved.

Social Science: The subcommittee could use some help finding/creating the assessment. In particular, in the coming weeks the AC will discuss it's history with finding/creating assessments and the possible pitfalls that can occur. Lynnel and Matthew feel that, likely, a tool will need to be created. It could be embedded, but this will require some more conversation. Todd suggested coming up with a topic and looking at it via various social scientific lenses. Also, the assessment needn't address all of the outcomes. Next week, we'll continue this conversation.

Assessment Week: There will be no assessment this semester during assessment week. We will instead focus on dissemination. In particular, we will focus on the QR and Science assessments along with the CCSSE. The AC will brainstorm more innovative dissemination techniques in order to reach more than just the "usual suspects" here at HWC and beyond. Part of this will take place when Todd (and others) update the AC website. Mike handed out a prototype for a digestible pamphlet for assessment result dissemination (I'm sure someone can come up with a catchier name). Jackie suggested that the pamphlet should be in addition to other dissemination/communication efforts. A variety of ideas were shouted out, so quickly that the secretary

couldn't write the names fast enough. Some of the ideas included putting assessment info in the Herald, talking to student government, sending it via student e-mail, skywriting (just kidding), etc...

Subcommittees

As is customary, subcommittees were redefined and reassigned. Here they are. Those with an * after their names are floaters. They are able to split themselves physically and mentally between committees (not a simple feat).

Effective Writing: Willard, Dave, Loretta(if in AC this semester), Jackie*, Todd*, Matthew

Social Science: Chris S., Lynnel, Matthew, Jackie*, Jeff

DFAW (Dissemination for Assessment Week): Mike*, Chao, John, Jaime, Maggie, Charles

Chris K. *

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm, and a great time was had by all.

Minutes Approved at the 2/3 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Charles and seconded by Todd.

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

2-3-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Charles McSweeney -- Advising
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Willard Moody – English
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Kurt Sheu -- Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Matthew Williams – ESL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Chris Kabir -- Office of Research & Planning

Absent

Michael called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm in Room 1040 of Harold Washington College. Prior to the meeting, the AC reviewed the meeting minutes from 1/27, Charles motioned to approve the 1/27 minutes; Todd seconded.

Incentives and Student Motivation

The AC discussed the efficacy of the iPod incentive for the QR assessment. Since there were not many drop-ins, the incentives were, in a way, more like rewards. As such, for the next assessment, we may not need as many of them. Todd noted that the incentives this time around may “incentivize” students in the future. They also added awareness of assessment around campus. Really, it comes down to thanking/compensating students for giving us their time.

Assessment Week

Since there'll be no actual assessment during assessment week, we will have a series of sessions throughout the week. One idea that Mike shared was a small-scale event for faculty. Clickers would be used for faculty to answer various questions about our previous assessment in hopes of winning a dinner with an 11th floor John (tentatively, and please read that in a PG way). The hope is for it to be an interactive session, something markedly different than what we've done in the past; something to draw more than just the “usual suspects”. This would go hand-in-hand with a more formal dissemination (e.g. the pamphlets discussed last week or a roundtable discussion). This led to discussion the creation of digital data files for the AC webpage. Todd will continue his work on this.

QR Assessment

Besides a handful of papers requiring a 2nd opinion, the QR grading is complete. The only task that remains is to go through the assessments to differentiate between the zeros on the open-ended questions (i.e. left blank vs. completely incorrect). Mike once again thanked Chao, Chris, Jeff and Kurt for their hard work and speed in grading the assessments. He promised to whip up more sticky toffee pudding (though Chris is still holding out for figgy pudding) as a token of his gratitude.

Social Science

In two weeks, the AC will invite some former members of the AC and others key figures from the AC past to the meeting to discuss historical pitfalls/troubles with assessments for the benefit of Social Science's search/creation of an assessment.

The AC broke into subcommittees at 3:34.

DFAW (Dissem. for Assessment Week) (Anthony, Charles, Chris K., Jaime, Mike, Todd(floated b/w all 3 thus breaking the laws of physics and possibly metaphysics)): The subcommittee discussed dissemination for the Science assessment and CCSSE. The subcommittee focused on the following questions. What are the procedures for 'accepting' or 'approval' for/of Assessment reports? How and when do reports come into the 'public domains'? Who gives the final approval before reports enter these domains? By next week, the subcommittee will circulate the final version of the Science assessment report all of AC. In addition, Mike will consult Jen Asimow and Carrie Nepstad in an attempt to answer the above questions.

Effective Writing (Jackie, Loretta, Willard): The Effective Writing Subcommittee discussed 2 sets of learning outcomes: one developed in 2009 and one developed in 2010. The subcommittee chose the 2010 version because it's more specific to a particular writing assignment than the 2009 version. The subcommittee also discussed the rubrics for the writing assessment. Two members favored a 3-point scale, one member favored a 4-point scale, and one member favored a 5-point scale. The difference in the points depends on the specificity in showing the range of writing skills from very competent to unsatisfactory. The subcommittee decided to choose one of these point systems later in the semester. (Thanks for the write-up Willard!)

Social Science (Chris S., Jeff, Kurt, Lynnel, Matthew): The main goal of the subcommittee is to find and/or create an assessment for the Social Science general education learning outcomes. First, the subcommittee reviewed the outcomes. They considered, perhaps, assessing only one or two as opposed to all four. Jeff and Matthew will search for existing assessment that would measure one or two outcomes rather than all four. The subcommittee also picked up a discussion from the summer concerning embedded assessments. In the end, though nothing was set in stone, the subcommittee thought that though it would be wonderful for faculty to have some freedom in the way in which they assessed the outcome(s), that this may lead to some extremely messy logistics. Just as the meeting was about to end, Chris shared his crackpot idea for an assessment. With the expertise and vision of Matthew and Jeff, the three constructed the following possible assessment.

The Crackpot idea... The assessment would be a mix of multiple choice and open-ended responses. There would be 7 passages about the same social issue (perhaps something broad like poverty or something specific like the earthquake in Haiti). Each passage would be written from the perspective (or preferably by) a different social scientist. For instance, a psychological perspective could be offered as well as a historic one, etc. The student would need to choose the perspective from which (s)he thought the passage was written. We could ask, "Do you think this passage was written by a(n) A) Historian B) Psychologist C) Geographer D) Sociologist?" Then, we would ask the student to, in writing, justify this answer. Finally, at the end we would ask the student to write her/his own passage about the topic. The idea is that the student would have read the previous perspective (which (s)he would not have access to as (s)he wrote her/his own passage) and write her own response. It would be interesting to see to which perspective(s) (s)he aligns with. As for the passages, Matthew thought we could have people in those fields write them. This could be people from area colleges/universities or HWC faculty. Asking HWC faculty to write these passages may increase buy-in from faculty for this assessment. This will be discussed at next week's meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 pm, and a great time was had by all considering that we stayed until after the bell rang.

Minutes Approved at the 2/10/10 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Jeff and seconded by Lynnel.
--

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

2-10-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
LaRhue Finney -- English
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
John Kieraldo -- Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Willard Moody – English
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Matthew Williams – ESL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Chris Kabir -- Office of Research & Planning

Absent

Charles McSweeney -- Advising
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
David Richaradson --
Kurt Sheu -- Mathematics

Michael called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm in Room 1040 of Harold Washington College. Prior to the meeting, Kurt sent his apologies. The AC reviewed the meeting minutes from 2/3. After a few grammatical fixes, Jeff motioned to approve the 2/3 minutes; Lynnel seconded.

Learning from our history

Mike told the committee that we will invite former members of the AC to our 2/24 meeting. The goal is to discuss some of the history of our assessments and to see if we are, in fact, learning from our experiences (and mistakes). In particular, Mike will ask Carrie Nepstad, Dave Richardson and Liliana Marin.

HLC Presentation Practice

Carrie (from above), Janvier Jones and Tricia Perez from Applied Science asked the AC if they could practice their upcoming HLC presentation at the AC's 4/7 meeting. The AC, of course, was excited for this, especially given that it's the week after spring break. However, they realized that this is assessment week. Chris went out on a limb to suggest that the presentation practice be included in our actual assessment week line-up since it fits into the dissemination theme of the week. Mike will check with Carrie on this one.

Carrie (yes, more Carrie) and Jenn A.

Mike had a chance to chat with Carrie and Jenn Asimow about past practice concerning AC reports. There is no standard procedure. This is something that needs to be worked out. Chris and Todd will include this information in their soon to be released seminal work on assessment. This led into a discussion about space... for storage that is, despite the presence of a physicist and a couple of math folks. In addition, the AC discussed the length of time in which assessments should be kept. Nothing was resolved though the conversation will continue. In fact, Jenn A. told Mike that some of the best lessons/biggest learning come from these debates and dialogues during the meetings. Some of the AC members asked Todd about using space in the library for past assessments and hard copies of reports. Todd said that we could just use the A001 to A999 section of the library for assessment materials (clearly, this is a joke). Todd will check on possible storage spaces.

Social Science Assessment Idea (a.k.a. Chris, Jeff and Matthew's Crackpot idea)

Chris, Jeff and Matthew shared their idea for the assessment with the AC. There was a lot of discussion about it. Lynnel brought up several good and legitimate concerns about how this assessment aligns with the outcomes. The idea was somewhat well received but a serious discussion of logistics must occur before anything is even close to being set. This will be discussed next week during subcommittee time. Also, the AC

has finally managed to get its hands on the most recent, and approved, version of the Soc. Sci. SLOs. They will be e-mailed to the working committee along with these minutes.

Homework/Miscellaneous

The AC has been asked/reminded to read/re-read the final report for the science assessment. Loretta suggested sending reports to departments as a means of disseminating and then having them report back to us. This could be implemented 'structurally' (I'm not exactly sure what I meant by this word, but it's in my notes.) Also, Todd and Chris will send out the most recent draft of the Assessment Handbook that they've been working on for the past 10 years (8 months really) soon.

Subcommittees

The main meeting was so action-packed that there was no time for subcommittees. Next week, there will be a lot of time for subcommittees.

The meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Minutes Approved at the 2/17 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Jackie and seconded by Lynnel.

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

2-17-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL

Todd Heldt – Library

Lynnel Kiely – Social Science

Chao Lu – Mathematics

Willard Moody – English

Dave Richardson -- Humanities

Chris Sabino – Mathematics

Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics

Loretta Visomirskis -- English

Matthew Williams – ESL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Absent

Anthony Escudro – Physical Science

LaRhue Finney – English

Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences

John Kieraldo – Library

Charles McSweeney – Advising

Jaime Millan – Physical Science

Kurt Sheu – Mathematics

Todd called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm in Room 1040 of Harold Washington College. Prior to the meeting, Michael sent his apologies. As such, Todd chaired the meeting in Mike's stead. The AC reviewed the meeting minutes from 2/10. After a few grammatical fixes, Jackie motioned to approve the 2/10 minutes; Lynnel seconded.

Science Assessment

The homework for the AC was to look over the final report for the Science Assessment. Given lower than usual attendance due to various schedule conflicts and, perhaps, something astrological, this discussion will be tabled until the first AC meeting in March (2 weeks). For those of us who were there, we commented upon how impressive the report was (or hid our heads because we didn't do our homework). Nonetheless, now the AC has more time to read the report. One of the AC executive committee (Mike, Todd or Chris) will e-mail the most recent version to AC members, if they so desire.

Learning from our history

Next week is when this will occur. This is a reminder. We will have visitors from AC's past telling us how it was back in the day when assessments cost only a nickel. In all seriousness, the AC is excited to have past members share their insights about past assessments. We hope to learn a lot.

Assessment Policy Manual (Todd and Chris's labour)

With any luck, Chris will send out the most recent version of the Policy Manual (a.k.a. Assessment Handbook, a.k.a. Assessment for Dummies) to the working committee of the AC for review. A few items need to be added before it is sent. Chris hopes to send it out before next meeting for discussion in a few weeks.

Destroying Past Assessments

Continuing the discussion from last week, Todd asked the AC how they felt about destroying previous assessments that had already been scored, stored, analyzed, etc. After some discussion, the committee agreed that this would be viable assuming that the results were stored electronically. A compromise was proposed but not voted on... The AC could keep a few copies of each assessment. Todd suggested saving assessments that fell into the various grading strata in order to have an artifact of these types of assessments for possible later use. The AC liked this idea and suggested keeping not only hard copies of these specific assessments but also scanning them. This is the motion on the floor. The committee will vote on this next week (or the week after).

Social Science Assessment

Lynnel found an interesting website on a past conference on assessing Social Science. She'll peruse it before next week to see if we can get some fresh ideas for our assessment. Also, Lynnel gave out the SLOs (most

recent version) for Social Science. In particular, she wondered from where (or from whom) the little introductory paragraphs from the course catalog originated. Do we need one for Social Science? Also, now that Soc. Sci 101 and 102 are no longer a requirement for the AA, how will this affect our efforts? Further, who did this change come from? Though this is not necessarily an AC issue, since the AC is assessing Soc. Sci. it is relevant.

1. Explain in oral and written form and through the use of technology, the interdisciplinary approach of the seven social sciences toward investigating society.
2. Apply the scientific method to social phenomena using relevant research designs.
3. Analyze historical, current, and hypothetical events through the lens of the social scientist.
4. Formulate questions and evaluate theories, concepts, and philosophies about social phenomena as applied to the personal pursuit of a quality life.

Attendance

In preparing the minutes for this week, Chris wondered whether he should continue listing absent members as absent given our somewhat variable membership as of late (or promoted variability in the future). Chris proposed that this information no longer be included. The AC members present agreed, but Todd thought it best to wait until Mike (and more members) was (were) present to make this decision. So there's a motion on the floor to remove the designation of absent in the minutes. We will vote on this next week (or the week after).

Effective Writing

The AC had a brief discussion about what the Effective Writing subcommittee is doing with respect to rubric creation. In the end, the AC deferred to the expertise of the subcommittee.

The AC broke into subcommittees (sort of) at 3:46

Effective Writing (everyone other than Chao, Chris and Jeff): The Effective Writing Subcommittee discussed a survey for the Effective Writing assessment. The survey covers students' writing performances in classes, students' other writing experiences, and students' attitudes toward writing. The survey is a rough draft now, so the subcommittee considered items to add to, omit from, or refine in the survey. The subcommittee will continue to tweak the survey in future meetings. (from Willard).

QR (Chao, Chris and Jeff): There was a little unfinished business for the QR subcommittee. Chris finally asked/reminded himself and the others about going through the graded assessments and noting those that had skipped the open ended questions. Chao, Chris, Jeff and Kurt will work on this next week.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes Approved at the 2/24 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Todd and seconded by Willard.
--

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

2-24-10

Members Attending

Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
LaRhue Finney – English
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
John Kieraldo – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Willard Moody – English
Dave Richardson -- Humanities
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Matthew Williams – ESL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Carrie Nepstad – Applied Science

Absent

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Charles McSweeney – Advising
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Kurt Sheu – Mathematics

Michael called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm in Room 1040 of Harold Washington College. Prior to the meeting, Jackie sent her apologies. The AC reviewed the meeting minutes from 2/17. After a few small fixes, Todd motioned to approve the 2/17 minutes; Willard seconded.

Social Science SLO update

Prior to the meeting, Lynnel found the formalized approved SLO's that had been missing for the past several weeks. Chris included them in the 2/17 minutes and will put them on Bb and elsewhere to ensure that they are not lost again. This has uncovered a weakness in the AC's archiving abilities. The AC has learned a valuable lesson and will be more diligent in keeping track of important documents.

Science Assessment

Mike was hoping for a fuller discussion of the Science Assessment report. He will talk to Jaime and Liliana about it before next week. Also, Mike is putting together a draft of an assessment finding brief for distribution to faculty in a few weeks.

Looking at our past (A conversation with Carrie and Dave)

Creating our own tool

The AC had an extensive discussion with Carrie Nepstad and Dave Richardson about past assessment practice. I will attempt to summarize what was said succinctly. Much of the conversation was question and answer. Lynnel began by asking Carrie about the challenges of assessment tool creation. Carrie first lauded the AC for all of its amazing work over the past few years. She had nothing but compliments for our recent efforts. In terms of creating a tool, Carrie felt that this is the best kind of assessment because it is tailored to our students. It can be difficult to find a manufactured tool with what we want. Also, by creating our own assessment tool, we know what we want to learn and are able to address that with the tool. In addition, Todd added that when he, Carrie and others have presented what we've done he feels that they feel that we "seem to be operating at a higher level". Creating a tool excites people in the field. "Their jaws hit the floor" when they see what we've (the AC) have done. (*Keep reading for another reference to Jaws.*) Carrie noted that assessment at other institutions is handled more by a research office rather than by faculty. Our strength, especially lately, is that we, the faculty, know the questions we want to ask the data before we get it. Also, she commented on how smoothly the QR assessment went and how our turnaround for assessment data and recommendations has gotten quicker.

Demographics, Lessons learned

Something that came up several times had to do with the demographics survey that originated on the humanities assessment and has since been reused and revamped for EBAPS and the QR assessment. The fact that this can be (and has been) reused has really saved time and brought consistency to our most recent assessments. Mike noted that a great deal of useful data has been ascertained from this in that we are able to compare student performance on the assessment to the amount of coursework that they have taken. Carrie says that this lesson was learned through the tedium of attempting to do a similar comparison on the CCTST (Critical thinking). The CCTST is an example of a manufactured assessment that generated lots of data requiring the AC many hours to make sense of it. Later on, Mike noted that it would be a goal to determine the “tipping point” or “dosage” that ensures student success. For instance, did students who’ve taken 3 math courses outperform those that didn’t on the QR assessment? We can answer this question thanks to the custom demographic survey.

Keeping it simple

Carrie and Dave said time and time again that one of the biggest lessons learned is to keep assessments simple. For example, the diversity survey generated so much data that much of it was unable to be used. Over the years, assessment has become more focused. Dave likened the AC’s efforts to evolving from fishing to shark hunting (“I think we’re gonna need a bigger boat.”) Instead of trying to assess every SLO’s, assessment tools should focus on only a few things. A goal should be to hit SLO’s more microscopically (rather than macroscopically?). Long story short... less is more and assessment tools should be designed to embrace this. This led to a conversation about the frequency of assessment administrations. Several people thought that we would benefit from more frequent smaller assessments instead of our current practice of large-scale assessments every 5-7 years (our current cycle).

Embedded assessment

Lynnel asked about the possibility of embedded assessment for Social Science. This idea came up over the summer with Lynnel and other members of Soc. Sci/Soc Sci subcommittee. Instructors could be given an idea of what was being assessed but would be given the autonomy to choose the method of assessment. Lynnel wondered about the feasibility of this. Carrie and others seemed to think that this is quite feasible as long as the rubric is carefully made and standardized. A few concerns that came up had to do with the diversity of data. Would it be comparable? Could we create a rubric to score every type of evidence? Lynnel asked about giving the assessment to only Social Science students or to those in other disciplines. Mike emphasized that voluntarism is key in our assessments. An imposition would be counter to what our goals for assessment. All assessments other than the CCSSE have been voluntary. Carrie thought that the assessment could be done within the department but also outside of the department. This will be revisited in the coming weeks.

Institutional vs. Departmental Assessment, blurring the line

“Assessment is assessment.” This was Carrie’s statement with respect to the connection between institutional and departmental assessment. In particular, the AC’s work is inextricably linked to departmental assessment. For instance, the humanities assessment attempted to assess a broad range of humanities courses since humanities consists of a broad range of course offerings. Feedback and involvement from the department was crucial. Todd mentioned a need for more Friday labs type activity. Stronger departmental assessment will strengthen overall institutional assessment. The 2 are different but are very much linked. Carrie told the AC that some of the pressure is off now that accreditation is done, but both Dave and Carrie said that we should be vigilant in promoting departmental assessment before 2019. Also, assessment tools from the AC could be used by departments. This practice should be encouraged. According to Carrie the point of assessment is to inform learning. Learning has to be at the center. Mike added that the AC also influences larger changes beyond the classroom.

Subcommittees are good

Dave emphasized that subcommittees are really important to the AC. They learned early on that big decisions were always more difficult with large groups. The subcommittees are helpful in making big decisions more quickly and efficiently. In addition, the strength of subcommittees is in their mixed composition. Faculty from various disciplines are able to work together to create assessments (possibly) in and out of their discipline. Also, subcommittees connect AC efforts to their departments.

In the end the AC was extremely grateful for the conversation. The goal, really, is to learn from our past in order to avoid mistakes/become more efficient in the future.

Old Business

Destroying Past Assessments

There was a motion from last week to destroy all but a handful of our past paper assessments assuming we have the data filed. The motion was to keep representative samples of student assessment in various achievement strata while discarding the rest of the assessments. Also, part of the motion was to scan those representative assessments. This would allow us to have a paper record in a file cabinet of the assessments as well as digital copies. The file cabinets would also house other important AC documents, in particular various reports. Todd motioned and Chris seconded. The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 2.

Attendance

After a brief conversation, this item (whether or not to include absences should be noted on the minutes) was tabled until next week.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Minutes Approved at the 3/3 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Loretta and seconded by Todd.

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

3-3-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
LaRhue Finney – English
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
John Kieraldo – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Willard Moody – English
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Anita Kelley – Business/CIS
John Metoyer – Office of Instruction

Absent

Charles McSweeney – Advising
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Dave Richardson -- Humanities
Kurt Sheu – Mathematics

Michael called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm in Room 1040 of Harold Washington College. The AC reviewed the meeting minutes from 2/24. Prior to the meeting, Carrie e-mailed Chris about changing some wording. Chris wholeheartedly agreed to change the word 'teaching' to learning in what follows (it's worth repeating here). "According to Carrie the point of assessment is to inform learning. Learning has to be at the center." Loretta motioned to approve the modified 2/24 minutes; Todd seconded.

The AC broke into subcommittees at 3:04 (in order to ensure that they had time to work, which was a brilliant idea. Thank you, Lynnel.)

Dissemination (Anthony, John K., Mike): The subcommittee discussed/brainstormed/wordsmithed slogans (5 bullet points) for a flier for assessment week (for the natural sciences focus). They went over briefly a several-page draft of the natural sciences briefing.

They also discussed a bit the assessment web site and the Assessment Times. Much of what they discussed came out later, or was re-told by John M. The idea is that the AC will wrestle control of the assessment site away from outside our control. John M. then spoke of this later on in the meeting. The subcommittee discussed possibly getting a domain from CCC outside of the awkward "faculty.ccc.edu/colleges/hwashington/cast" ... i.e., something like hwcassessment.ccc.edu, but they're not sure that's going to happen.

Todd and John K. will collaborate on the Assessment Times and the Assessment Web. (by John K., thanks John)

Effective Writing (Jackie, LaRhue, Loretta, Todd (floater), Willard): The Effective Writing Subcommittee discussed a survey for the Effective Writing assessment. The survey covers students' writing performances in classes, students' other writing experiences, and students' attitudes toward writing. The survey is a rough draft now, so the subcommittee considered items to add to, omit from, or refine in the survey. The subcommittee will continue to tweak the survey in future meetings. (by Willard, thanks Willard)

Social Science (Chao, Chris K., Chris S., Jeff, Lynnel, Matthew): Lynnel sent the subcommittee a proposal for the Social Science assessment. At the end of the meeting, the subcommittee presented the proposal to the entire AC. Essentially, it consists of 3 or 4 parts. As has been common practice as of late, it will include some

type of demographic/affective component. The subcommittee decided that this could be adapted from the humanities, science and QR demographic pieces. The other two parts of the assessment consist of students being able to distinguish the 7 social sciences from each other (one part) while creating questions, which encapsulate each of the social sciences (another part). Look out for a final draft of the proposal soon. The subcommittee talked about logistics and a grading rubric. In the end, the subcommittee decided that the various components of the identification portion of the assessment (the part in which students are given a paragraph from a particular social science perspective and asked to discern from which perspective it is coming) will be created by members of the subcommittee. Tentatively, Jeff will write the Economics piece. Matthew=History, Lynnel=Psychology, Chris=Anthropology. The subcommittee will flesh this out next week. (by me, thanks me)

Old Business

1. AC membership

Mike sent an e-mail to chairs and current AC members to get a declaration/confirmation of membership and representation for their departments. Mike received several e-mails. He will share the specific results next week.

2. Absences on the minutes vote

A few weeks ago, Chris (me), while typing up the minutes, questioned why the AC minutes was the only committee in which absences were recording. As such, he motioned to no longer include this designation in the minutes. A brief discussion ensued. In particular, the absence designation does hold people accountable since they are representing their department. Chris mentioned again that even the FC, a group that has elected members, doesn't have this designation in it's minutes though he can see both sides of this issue. The AC voted. The motion was voted down with 6 nays, 3 yeas, and 3 abstentions. Therefore, the status quo remains. Just a word from me, I truly could see either side of this issue. I think it brings to bear a larger issue. Why do we do the things that we do? What is the history/genesis of various procedures? A written record of our history could be powerful and useful...perhaps a compilation of our reports. We can talk about this at a future meeting, assuming you've read these last few sentences (catch-22).

New Business

1. Assessment Policy Manual

Todd and Chris sent an electronic version to the committee. Overall, the response was good. In fact, John M. wants to distribute it to all faculty. He mentioned creating CD's. Chris and Todd told him that though they liked this idea, since the manual is meant to be a living document, CDifying it would make it inert. John M. agreed and, as such, he'll (now we since we have ownership of the site, read below) include a pdf file on the Assessment Website and other places like haroldlounge.com. A few concerns for John M. and Mike (and Chris and Todd) had to do with the formatting, pitch and audience of the policy manual.

Mike (I think.): It doesn't have a title page; that's perverse. "It looks like it wants to be a policy manual and a how-to guide."

Chris (glib and serious, but laughing on the inside): "That's why it doesn't have a title page."

Also, Todd and Chris are aware of the conflicting nature of some of the material in the manual (how-to vs. policies/procedures) but feel that these things do go hand-in-hand. With respect to format, John M. has some people working on graphics since this manual is an HWC publication, in a way. Also, Chris and Todd, whose intention was context, not format, will look at the formatting.

Chris's conception of the manual varied a bit from others. He was hoping for more interactivity in the document. Others viewed this document as official record and something distributable beyond HWC. In order to address Chris and Todd's desire for interactivity, John M. suggested a google site that has blogging capability. Nothing is entirely set in stone. This will continue to be fleshed out.

2. AC Website

One of John M.'s main reasons for being at the AC meeting (other than dazzling us with his wit) was to "hand over" ownership of the AC webpage. Prior to the meeting, he gave Todd and John K. access to the webpage.

They (we, the AC, really) will now be able to edit the webpage as they (we) see fit.

Miscellaneous

1. Not another subcommittee

Todd, in an effort to create as many subcommittees as there are people, ☺, asked the AC about starting a subcommittee to decide which assessment artifacts to keep and which to pitch. The AC agreed that this is a good idea.

2. Assessment times

Todd asked about the location of digitized copies of the Assessment times. Todd will retrieve them from the website.

3. QR status

Chris and Jeff lugged several boxes of the QR assessments up 3 flights of stairs, in the snow, barefoot. All but 100 or so are ready to be scanned. A sigh of general relief left Chris's mouth as he waved goodbye to his babies, albeit temporarily. He's excited to have his office uncluttered again. With any luck, the scanning will be done in a few weeks. John M. told Chris K. that he had people who could scan if he was short-staffed.

4. QR preliminary data

Chao, Chris and Jeff, at the request of Mike, shared some of their impressions of the results of the QR assessments. They all agreed that the results, the student work on the open-ended questions, were a bit troubling, though not unexpected. Chris told the AC that he noticed that no student skipped the first open-ended question, unless they skipped them all. The most skipped questions seemed to be the 2nd half of the 1st open-ended question and the 2nd problem, though there were a significant number of skipped questions. Also, performance on the pizza problem, the last problem, was horrific (this has yet to be substantiated with data). Chao noted that for her question, the first half of the 1st question, there was a somewhat bimodal distribution. It was all or nothing in terms of correctness with little gray area. Jeff shared these sentiments and added that students had great difficulty with units on his problem, the 2nd problem.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Minutes Approved at the 3/17 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Anthony and seconded by Jeff.
--

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

3-10-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
LaRhue Finney – English
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Charles McSweeney – Advising
Willard Moody – English
Dave Richardson -- Humanities
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Apologies

John Kieraldo – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Kurt Sheu – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics

Absent

Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
Jaime Millan – Physical Science

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Christopher Kabir – Office of Research and Planning
Ephrem Rabin – Office of Instruction

The meeting was called to order by Mike at 3:05 pm. Apologies were given for those members unable to attend and welcome was extended to Ephrem who was the specific guest of the Social Science Sub-Committee.

Approval of Minutes

No adjustments were suggested from the floor. Mike had a few which he will pass to Chris and the minutes of the March 3rd meeting will be brought before the March 17th meeting for approval.

Sub-Committee Time

Not enough members were present at the outset of the meeting to make subcommittees viable and so a general discussion was begun with Ephrem about the possibilities of using Blackboard as the key technology for the Social Science Assessment in the fall semester.

Ephrem needed to look at a specific sample questionnaire and promised to use this to look into Blackboard capabilities. He was clear that the test function would not meet the criteria we needed, in that aggregate data cannot be collected and analyzed across classes. He was fairly sure that our required sample size of 750 to 1,000 students could not be handled by Blackboard through the usual functions he was aware of.

The good news is that there is a 'survey' function within Blackboard which may indeed serve our purposes better. Ephrem will look into this and keep in touch with Lynnel and Matthew about what he discovers. Lynnel will also send draft questionnaires for Ephrem to work with (always happens when you, Lynnel, are not there).

We thanked Ephrem for his contribution and he graciously told us about the upcoming technology day which was bursting with workshops and powerful presenters.

Approval of Natural Science Posters

Mike had previously circulated these drafts to the committee and had full size mock ups on the board for people to see and comment on. There was considerable discussion and debate about all five of these posters and the usual explaining, exploring and wordsmithing took place at some length. It was made clear that the statements being made were designed to be curt, dialogic, questioning and grounded firmly in the findings of our Natural Science Assessment. With regard to poster three, Dave felt it important that we send the message that we found our outcomes match other colleges and this would help work against the dominant perception that a community college education was somehow less than that offered at other colleges. This point was well taken. The agreed finalized posters were as follows:

- 1) Apply Natural Sciences. Really?
- 2) You are a Scientific Expert. How?
- 3) HWC Natural Science Classes: good as anywhere else. Taken yours?
- 4) Science Deep or Science Surface. You?
- 5) Comfortable with Science but only if we help you. Why?

Each poster would also contain in very small print the reference to our report, "2008 General Education Natural Science Assessment Report." It was also suggested this should be followed by the legend: 'Ask your teacher.'

Finalize Copy for Assessment Findings Briefing: Natural Sciences

Mike reported that he had made edits based on feedback from Chris Kabir and Liliana Marin. Willard agreed to do his usual, and much valued proof reading, to ensure our written communications were up to standard! He will return the edited copy to Mike by Friday. This copy will then go to Heather Shevitz to be turned into a glorious full color electronically distributed PDF. Final visual approval will be given to the committee before circulation – as part of Assessment Week.

Assessment Times Draft Approval

Todd had been working on this and was awaiting finalization of a few pieces. This should come before the committee next week for final approval before printing and circulation. Ideally it should go out before spring break, as part of pre-publicity for Assessment Week (Week 12).

Chair Updates

New website domain had been established and content was being worked on, transferring material from old site and updating. QR assessments were being scanned, no clear timeline for when this would be finished.

AOB

No other business was raised.

Meeting closed at 4:00pm. Minutes taken by Mike H. (and cut and pasted by Chris S.) ☺

Minutes Approved at the 3/17 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Jacqueline and seconded by Todd.

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

3-17-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
LaRhue Finney – English
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
John Kieraldo – Library
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Christopher Kabir – Office of Research and Planning
Ephrem Rabin – Office of Instruction

Apologies

Loretta Visomirskis -- English

Absent

Charles McSweeney – Advising
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Willard Moody – English
Kurt Sheu – Mathematics

The meeting was called to order by Mike at 3:10 pm in room 1040, though from 3-3:10 there was some informal conversation with Ephrem with respect to the logistics of the Social Science Assessment.

Approval of Minutes

No adjustments were suggested from the floor. Mike had a few which passed on to Chris. Anthony motioned to accept the 3/3 minutes; Jeff seconded. Jackie motioned to accept the 3/10 minutes; Todd seconded.

Sub-Committee Time (from 3:15-3:48)

Dissemination(Mike Heathfield, Anthony Escudro, John Kieraldo & Christopher Kabir) by Mike

1) The redone Natural Science posters were shown to subcommittee members.

2) A listing of Assessment Committee products was provided:

Assessment Times – due to go to print by end of this week and circulated next week.

Natural Science Report 'Question' Posters – go to print this week and in classrooms for Assessment Week (12)

Natural Science Assessment Findings Brief – to accompany posters circulated electronically to faculty, staff and student organizations – Assessment Week distribution (currently awaiting 11th floor graphic magic).

CCSSE Findings Brief – hopefully before the end of semester (thanks Chris for your contribution already).

3) Assessment Week – Schedule and Ideas

The subcom. wondered if Math faculty wanted to present any preliminary results from the recent QR survey currently being scanned. (They would rather wait).

It was noted that 'Tipping Point' was now "Learning Leap". Ideas for 'Know It And Show It Assessment Week Team Challenge' were discussed. Mike will produce a powerpoint with at least 20 questions based on assessment data. Anthony will provide clickers for participants to answer and get instant data to make the session more fun and interactive. The idea is not that people should/will know the answers but that we can engage/immerse them in some key or surprise findings from many of our institutional assessments. It was decided question areas would be as follows:

- 5 from CCSSE – Chris will have a go at these, would be great if we could do some 2005 & 2009 comparison questions.
- 5 from Natural Science – Mike will do these
- 5 from current HWC demographic data – Mike to get these from Keenan

- 5 from Humanities – Dave will give these to Mike through the previous ‘campaign’ we mounted on assessment data.

It was also wondered if the AC could get 5 questions from our Diversity assessment – Mike will check with Carrie about this, but had a feeling much of this data was unexamined.

The subcom. decided that everyone would be invited, students, staff and faculty and be seated at round tables – these would then become teams simply based on their seating arrangements. Mike will try to get to work on this for next week but may not get to it until spring break.

4) Website name – The subcommittee disliked the current website name because it starts with the word “google”. John K. is working on getting a new domain name that links better to HWC.

Effective Writing (Jackie, LaRhue, Matthew, Todd)

The subcommittee discussed whether the Effective writing assessment should have an affective portion. The subcommittee was still up in the air on this thought they’re leaning toward not having one. They also discussed whether questions about reading should be included given that many felt there is a correlation between reading and writing. They also discussed the logistics. What will the format of the assessment be? Will it be embedded? This would be a different flavor (a tasty flavor according to Todd). Faculty may “relish it” since it’s something different. This will continue to be worked out, but the subcom. assured Mike that a rough draft should be ready by the end of the semester.

Social Science (Chao, Chris, Jeff, Lynnel)

The subcommittee continued the discussion of the logistics for the Soc. Sci. assessment. They discussed how the survey and assessment will occur, technologically. They also discussed which questions should be included in the demographic portion. Chris showed Lynnel the demographic portion for the QR assessment. She and others agreed that the Soc. Sci. demographic portion could draw from this. The assessment and demographic portion will all be given through Bb and Survey Monkey. The subcom. also discussed whether to break students into groups based upon the number of Social Science course taken. The subcom. decided that this will be useful data (institutionally and departmentally). But, in order to assess the interdisciplinarity of Social Science, we should include total credits (as has been the common practice). The subcom. will continue to talk logistics and also start preparing the passages for the assessment.

Assessment Times (AT)

Mike handed out near-final draft copies of the AT for the AC to peruse. Todd told the AC that the content is as it will be, but the format will be tweaked by John K. before it goes to print. Mike asked the AC to look over the draft ASAP since he hopes to send it to print by Friday. It was also suggested that the AT be “Willarded”.
(Definition: Willarded (past tense of Willard (verb)- to dutifully proofread and correct various grammatical issues known only to those in the know))

Assessment Week (AW)

Mike told the AC that the details for AW are being worked on. We will, in fact, have clickers for one of the sessions. This is something new for the AC. The session will focus on assessment findings but in a quiz show sort of way.

AOB

Dave (and Mike) talked about when (and by whom) the newest annual report will be written. They also discussed officer elections, which will occur sometime in the near future.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03pm.

Minutes Approved at the 3/24 Assessment Committee Meeting
Motion to approve proposed by Jeff and seconded by Todd.

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

3-24-10

Members Attending

Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
LaRhue Finney – English
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
Charles McSweeney – Advising
Willard Moody – English
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Christopher Kabir – Office of Research and Planning

Apologies

Kurt Sheu -- Mathematics

Absent

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
John Kieraldo – Library
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Dave Richardson – Humanities

The meeting was called to order by Mike at 3:05 pm in room 1040.

Approval of Minutes

Jeff motioned to accept the 3/17 minutes with some slight modifications; Todd seconded.

Assessment Times (AT)

The AT was distributed to faculty yesterday. Chris will put it up on the Harold lounge. Mike thanked Todd for putting it together and John K. for formatting it.

Assessment Week (AW)

Mike reminded AC members to encourage others to attend the AW sessions. The posters and other publicity will occur soon. The AW schedule is as follows:

Assessing Student Learning on Diversity for Classroom, Program, & Instruction

Carrie Nepstad, Janvier Jones and Patricia Perez
Wednesday April 7th 3:00 - 3:45pm Room 1115

Natural Science at HWC: The 'Learning Leap' and other findings

Jaime Millán, Christopher Kabir, Allan Wilson and Mike Heathfield
Thursday April 8th 2:00 – 2:45 pm Room 1115

Know It and Show It Assessment Team Challenge

Open to all - Faculty Teams, Student/Faculty Teams, Student Teams. (Join us, we will sort out "teams"!)
Know It and Show It Assessment Team Challenge
Thursday April 8th 3-4 pm Room 1115

Local Conferences

Todd wondered whether we, the AC, should be attending local meetings like the upcoming HLC conference. Chris suggested that this could become a tradition and perhaps put into the charge. At the next meeting, the AC will look at the agenda from HLC. **Before the end of the semester, the AC will revisit the charge.**

QR Reasoning

The QR data has been fully scanned thanks to Chris K. and some work studies. It took 10 full days with Chris K. passing and giving the assessment to a data enterer. In total, the work took about 90 hours (180 person hours since there were two working at any point, Chris K. a work study). Given that the QR assessment had more pages than the Science assessment, this made the work a bit more difficult. In the future, less pages or a move to fully digital may be best. Big thanks to Chris K., his staff, John Metoyer and the QR subcommittee for the “incredible” (Mike’s word) speed on this turnaround. Now Chris S. will spend the next 3 years (plus or minus 2.4 years) on data analysis and report writing.

Clicker practice fun run

In preparation for the AW “Know It and Show It Assessment Team Challenge”, Anthony brought the clickers to so we could play. The purpose of this activity is to promote dialogue. In the end, the trial run went very well with some AC members getting very into it. Anthony and Mike will make a few tweaks to the PowerPoint so we’re ready for AW.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes Approved at the 4/14/10 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Jeff and seconded by Lynnel.
--

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

4-14-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
Willard Moody – English
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Christopher Kabir – Office of Research and Planning

Apologies

Absent

LaRhue Finney – English
John Kieraldo – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Charles McSweeney – Advising
Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Kurt Sheu -- Mathematics

Mike called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm in room 1040.

Approval of Minutes

Jeff motioned to accept the 3/24 minutes; Lynnel seconded.

Assessment Week (AW) and Future AC dissemination

Mike thanked all of the presenters and attendees of AW, though there were very few of them. Mike called AW a “non-event” given the low turnout for the presentations. Jeff asked about past AW attendance. Mike and others told him that it’s been thin with at best large number of AC members but not many others. The following question was posed, almost in unison. “Why do we keep holding events when everything is so crammed?” The consensus was that we need to find other ways to disseminate our findings. Todd suggested for the AC to ask to come to department meetings, possibly by setting up a “semesterly” meeting with each department. This would guarantee an audience. Many liked this idea. Some suggested that our time at the department meeting should be brief in order to ensure that we’re not taking up too much time while still getting our point across. Lynnel suggested that someone from AC should attend a Chairs’ meeting to see which departments truly know what the AC does. This could be educational.

As the conversation meandered, Mike reminded the committee of some internal documents, which state that historically there’s been only one AW per year. Also, until recently, AW was a data gathering venture, not a dissemination activity. Thus, we can move away from feeling obligated to disseminate during AW. Chris suggested having one “open” AC meeting per month in which the invite is sent to all faculty.

One take away of the Gen. Ed. Science presentation was that we (the AC) need to attempt to get more use out of our data. Mike suggested that we (the AC) in collaboration with departments could use findings to create cross-curricular materials to “get at” student shortcomings (for lack of a better word). Along the same lines, Lynnel mentioned that the Gen. Eds. are never really “spelled out” for new faculty. This could be a worthwhile conversation to nurture faculty ownership of the Gen. Eds. and to give them insight “cross curricularly”.

Finally, Loretta asked about administrative support. In particular, what does the AC have with respect to administrative support? Occasionally we have a dean at our meetings, but lately our main connection is Chris K. who has been charged to support the AC. Loretta suggested that an umbrella administrative effort may help to provide more of a “foothold” for our efforts campus-wide.

Future Spring 2010 agenda items

We discussed the remaining agenda items that need to be addressed this semester.

1. The charge: In particular, making official the connection between AC and FC. This, apparently, was never officially done though the language in the charge was changed.
2. Officer elections (4/28)
3. Review policy manual: We need input about what's missing (e.g. an exact process for AC report finalizing). Also, who is the audience? How and when do artifacts become official?

Social Science Update

Lynnel told the AC that we have the concept for the assessment, but need more meeting time to divvy up actual assignments. It is possible to get a pilot together before end of semester but may need outside time. The assessment has 3 sections.

- 1) Students read a scenario and decide which social science discipline it come from (a best fit).
- 2) A demographic and affective survey
- 3) Students read about a particular event and formulate questions through the lens of various Soc. Sci. disciplines.

With reference to the first part, AC members would write these scenarios with guidance from HW faculty in those disciplines.

The AC broke into subcommittees at 3:41.

Effective Writing: The Effective Writing Subcommittee discussed what the survey of students' writing experiences and attitudes should include. They also discussed the rubric to be used to score the essays from the assessment. Alas, they could reach no agreement on either issue.

Social Science (Chris, Jeff, Lynnel, Matthew): The subcommittee brainstormed about possible topics for the scenarios. They tried to think of topics that would not immediately lead a student to a particular Soc. Science. For instance, Chris mentioned writing a scenario about the so-called Racial Achievement Gap vis a vis Political Science. Jeff, Chris and Matthew, while working out some of the details for creating these scenarios, began to doubt their credentials for creating these pieces. Over e-mail, after the meeting, Lynnel reassured the subcommittee that this is within their expertise and if they are feeling underprepared, they'll have someone from Soc. Sci. to consult with. This is the best of both worlds. The reason behind not asking faculty from Soc. Sci. to write each piece in the first place was due to the fact that it would likely adversely affect our timeline.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes Approved at the 4/21 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Willard and seconded by Loretta.

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

4-21-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL

LaRhue Finney – English

Todd Heldt – Library

Lynnel Kiely – Social Science

Willard Moody – English

Chris Sabino – Mathematics

Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics

Loretta Visomirskis -- English

Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Christopher Kabir – Office of Research and Planning

Apologies

Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences

Charles McSweeney – Advising

Absent

Anthony Escudro – Physical Science

John Kieraldo – Library

Chao Lu – Mathematics

Jaime Millan – Physical Science

Dave Richardson – Humanities

Kurt Sheu -- Mathematics

Todd called the meeting to order at 3:07 pm in room 1040, in Mike's stead.

Approval of Minutes

Willard motioned to accept the 4/14 minutes with slight changes; Loretta seconded.

Social Science pre-pilot

Lynnel gave the AC three scenarios that she and Chris K. whipped up prior to the meeting. The scenarios are a slight departure from what the subcommittee had discussed last week. These scenarios consist of fabricated conversations between social sciences from the same disciplines. The task is for students to read the scenario and decide which discipline best represents the perspective from which the social scientist are hailing. The AC read them over and attempted the assessment. The AC provided Lynnel with comments to tweak the scenarios. She'll put these into effect and the subcommittee will consider them for the creation of the other 6 scenarios. The AC liked this idea and the subcommittee will move forward to create the other 6 scenarios.

The AC broke into subcommittees at 3:25 pm.

Effective Writing: (Jackie, LaRhue, Loretta, Todd, Willard): The subcommittee continued discussing the logistics for an assessment. Todd passed out a sample assessment to prompt discussion. Discussion was spirited. The subcom members will take the survey home and make suggestions over e-mail. The following questions came up for the subcommittee and the AC as a whole to consider.

1) Should we use assignments taken from classes across the curriculum or should we have students come to the computer lab and compose original essays for our measure?

- 2) Indirect questions are the ones that ask about student confidence levels. Do we gain anything by including such questions along with the prompt?
- 3) How do we plan to "build the cohorts?" How does that decision affect the design of the measure? Does it?
- 4) In case we decide to have only one writing prompt, what should it be?
- 5) If we offer students a choice between several writing prompts, how does that decision alter our preparation for scorer-calibration meetings?
- 6) If we opt instead to use student writing taken from different classes, how great is the worry that we will receive plagiarized work or work that does not accurately reflect a student's own abilities?
- 7) Conversely, if we give students a single prompt and 50 minutes in which to write an essay, do we lose meaning because we are in fact not assessing written communication so much as ability to communicate in writing really, really quickly?

Social Science: (Chris K., Chris S., Jeff, Lynnel, Matthew): The subcommittee committee divvied up the remaining scenario writing. They are as follows:

Matthew: History

Jeff: Sociology

Chris K.: Geography

Chris S.: Political Science

Lynnel: Psychology

The subcommittee members will write these ASAP with the help of members of the Social Science department.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes Approved at the 4/28 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Todd and seconded by Jackie.

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes

4-28-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
LaRhue Finney – English
Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
John Kieraldo – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Willard Moody – English
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Vincent Wiggins – OIT
Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Christopher Kabir – Office of Research and Planning

Apologies

Charles McSweeney – Advising

Absent

Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Kurt Sheu -- Mathematics

Mike called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm in room 1040.

Approval of Minutes

Todd motioned to accept the 4/21 minutes; Jackie seconded.

Old business

Mike shared some information about a RFP due on June 30th for a General Education and Assessment conference in Chicago next March from the AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities). He received this from Carrie and thought that the AC should do this. It would be a good fit for us and wouldn't take much effort. Loretta asked if the RFP would be individual or joint. Mike thought that both were possibilities. Nothing was set in stone.

Effective writing questions

Mike opened up the floor on some of the questions from the Effective writing subcommittee. Here's some of the highlights.

1) Should we use assignments taken from classes across the curriculum or should we have students come to the computer lab and compose original essays for our measure?

Mike said that the preference would be to use things that are already written. This will be less work, a double hit. Our students are doing "truckloads of writing." Given that we've got "one shot" assessment down pat, using pre-existing work would be a new avenue. Loretta told the AC that they did this Daley and it worked really well for them.

2) Indirect questions are the ones that ask about student confidence levels. Do we gain anything by including such questions along with the prompt?

Although most of the AC agrees that confidence can be used as an indirect indicator, Mike proposed that we stick to the SLOs for now. If the SLOs don't discuss confidence, we needn't assess it. The committee agreed though the conversation will likely occur again.

3) How do we plan to "build the cohorts?" How does that decision affect the design of the measure? Does it?

After a few translation issues from English to english between Mike and Todd, some clarity was gleaned. Todd explained, and Mike restated, that the cohorts traditionally have been based upon the number of courses students have successfully completed. At the finest grain size, this has been discipline specific (e.g. science courses, math courses). Todd was thinking that these cohorts could be more specific. The cohorts would give us (the AC) an “access point into the data”. Since this is essentially writing across the curriculum we’d want to account for the diversity of writing experiences students are exposed to in a variety of courses. Having information about the humanities courses students have taken will be of great usefulness. The subcommittee will work out the details. In particular, they’ll make some assumptions about the variables that affect writing in order to define cohorts.

Summer projects

Mike asked the AC about possible summer projects. Nothing was fully set in stone but here are a few things that will occur.

- 1) Social Science Assessment Pilot: fine-tune instrument and pilot
- 2) QR report (Chris): analyze data, write a 10-100 page report
- 3) EBAPs workshop conversation English/Science materials: After the EBAP’s AW workshop Mike and others discussed created cross-curricular materials to address science.
- 4) Assessment Report (Mike): our annual report

Miscellaneous

- We need to check on the timeline for Effective Writing (EW). As it stands, we’ll pilot S.S. this summer and run it full scale in the fall. The EW pilot will likely be in the fall though we need to double-check this.
- Next week is our last AC meeting for the semester. Mike will bring in a sweet British treat of some sort. Sadly no fish and chips or bangers and mash will be present.
- We’ll hold off on the formal revision of the charge until the fall.
- The AC is happy to welcome Vincent Wiggins (OIT) to its ranks as our technology guru (not an official title, but it sounds good).

President’s newsletter and other kudos

Mike shared some accolades of the AC with the AC. In particular, there was a piece in the President’s newsletter giving praise to the AC’s hard work. In particular Mike and Todd got a nice shout out (none for little old me though). Mike also shared some complimentary e-mails from President Wozniak and Cecilia Lopez.

Officer elections

After 3 years and almost 100 minutes written Chris (the guy writing these minutes) announced he’d be stepping down from the secretary position. The AC thanked him. He blushed. Jeff Swigart was nominated for the position of secretary. He ran unopposed and was elected by acclamation. Chris let out a sigh of relief as he bequeathed his laptop to Jeff (this didn’t actually happen but wouldn’t that have been an amazingly fitting ceremonial changing of the guard type moment). Mike and Todd remain Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, of the AC as they ran unopposed and were re-elected by acclamation.

The AC broke into subcommittees at 3:30.

Social Science (Chao, Chris K., Chris S, Jeff, Lynnel, Matthew, Vincent): The subcom. discussed the creation of the scenarios. After some discussion, they realized that they were all just about completed. Chris S. sent his scenario to the group during the meeting. Lynnel will look them over and next week the subcommittee will fine-tune them. The subcommittee also talked about their time-line for the rest of the semester and the summer. They agreed to work next week to look at the scenarios and attempt to figure out the scenario for the open-ended segment of the assessment. Lynnel also asked the subcommittee to find the demographic/affective portions of the last few assessments in order to create our own.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes Approved at the 5/5 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Loretta and seconded by Willard.
--

Harold Washington College Assessment Committee

Committee Chair – *Mike Heathfield, Applied Science*

Committee Vice Chair – *Todd Heldt, Library*

Committee Secretary – *Chris Sabino, Mathematics*

Minutes (approved)

5-5-10

Members Attending

Jacqueline Cunningham – ELL WL
Anthony Escudro – Physical Science
LaRhue Finney – English
Todd Heldt – Library
Lynnel Kiely – Social Science
John Kieraldo – Library
Chao Lu – Mathematics
Willard Moody – English
Chris Sabino – Mathematics
Jeffrey Swigart – Mathematics
Loretta Visomirskis -- English
Vincent Wiggins – OIT
Matthew Williams – ELL WL

Advisors and Visitors Attending

Christopher Kabir – Office of Research and Planning

Apologies

Michael Heathfield -- Applied Sciences
Charles McSweeney – Advising

Absent

Jaime Millan – Physical Science
Dave Richardson – Humanities
Kurt Sheu -- Mathematics

Todd called the meeting to order at 3:08 pm in room 1040, in Mike's stead.

Approval of Minutes

Loretta motioned to accept the 4/28 minutes with expectation of adding the EW subnotes; Willard seconded.

Meta-Assessment

Mike created an assessment of the assessment activities this semester. Chris S. and Todd handed it out and watched people complete it as they (and everyone else) ate pizza and drank soda in honor of the final AC meeting of the semester.

The AC broke into subcommittees at 3:25.

Social Science (Chao, Chris K., Chris S, Jeff, Lynnel, Matthew, Vincent): Lynnel gave out previous demographic/affective surveys as well as a draft of the first part of the Soc. Sci. Assessment. The subcommittee attempted to decide when to meet in May or June. Also, the subcommittee will split into subsets as follows:

- Part 2: Qualitative/Affective/Demographics: Jeff, Chris S., Chao
 - Part 1: clean up/one more scenario: Vincent, Lynnel, Todd
 - Part 3: Creation of scenario (could be about Haiti, the recession, Katrina): Matthew, Chris K., Lynnel
- The goal is for the subsets to finish tasks before Tuesday 6/8. They meet in Lynnel's office at 1:00 to discuss their progress and prepare to pilot.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes Approved at the 9/1/2010 Assessment Committee Meeting Motion to approve proposed by Jen Asimow and seconded by Chao Lu.
--