



Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College

Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning),Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst),Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)



Minutes for 9/4/2019 (Approved)
3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Yev Lapik - Biology</i> <i>Erica McCormack - Humanities and Music</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences and Music</i> <i>Camelia Salajejan - Math</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phillip Vargas - Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams - ELL and WL</i></p>		<p>Agenda</p> <p><i>I. Welcome! Introductions</i> <i>II. Updates re: Admin</i> <i>III. Review semester calendar</i> <i>IV. Assessment Times (Liaison articles)</i> <i>V. Updates from Coordinator of Co-curricular (Mike)</i> <i>VI. Homework--review current GenEd Goals/SLOs and one report's recommendations</i></p>
---	--	---

Erica- Called the meeting to order at 3:00pm

I. Welcome! Introductions

II. Updates re: Admin

- Erica will meet with Vice Pres and Dean of Instruction. (Carrie and Jeff may join)
- The college (and therefore committee) is in a state of flux/change
- Possible impact-release time for committee
- Start to think about the pitch process from scratch
- This is likely the last semester with our current structure

- Goal: Structure committee to align with our priorities.
- Grants: Carrie and Kristin will investigate grants as a possible source of temporary outside income

III. Review semester calendar

IV. Assessment Times (Liaisons will produce articles as their main deliverable this semester)

V. Updates from Coordinator of Cocurricular (Mike)

- Report contains 9 separate areas
- Focus on two areas this fall (Wellness Center and Transfer, Advising)
- Erica will send report for everyone
- Next meeting: review report after everyone has read, and provide feedback
- SLO primary focus

VI. Homework--review current GenEd Goals/SLOs and one report's recommendations

- Review documents, current charge, and one recent Gen Ed report and specific recommendations to determine what we've learned and what to avoid. Erica will email with a reminder.

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

These minutes were approved by ----- Carrie and seconded by ----- Michael



Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning), Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst), Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 9/11/2019 Approved)
3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Terrance Hopson-Administration</i> <i>Yev Lapik - Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Erica McCormack - Humanities and Music</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Camelia Salajejan - Math</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phillip Vargas - Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams - ELL and WL</i> <i>Paul Wandless- Art and Architecture</i></p>		<p>I. Quick update about preparing for meeting with admin II. Discuss, Approve Co-Curricular Report III. Discuss GenEd reports and recommendations: patterns, outliers? IV. Discuss structural priorities for future committee work, organizational possibilities V. Homework</p>
--	--	--

Erica- Called the meeting to order at 3:00pm

I. Quick update about preparing for meeting with admin

- Erica and Carrie will meet with the Dean and Vice President September 16, 2019. Committee members, please reach out to Erica with suggested topics before the meeting.

II. Discuss, Approve Co-Curricular Report (attached again here)

- Suggestions:
 - Michael pointed out that he should add page numbers
 - Take names off the report of those no longer at HWC when it pertains to future work, but leave titles of individuals to display participation
 - Carrie suggested to add a formal definition of Co-Curricular Assessment to the report.
 - Carrie also wondered about the potential role of RI, specifically is there a way to use the existing data. Additionally, Carrie suggested there needs to be a shift from the data that is collected to SLOs and learning goals

- Domenico suggested to add a sample SLO in the report on page 4
- Terrance commented that goals and objectives are the starting points because they are measurable. He shared that NIU's co-curricular assessment plans all have robust, measurable SLOs and may be a model to consider.
- Kristin suggested the use of a tracking method
- Michael also emphasized that an internal change must occur within students to demonstrate their learning, not just a tabulation of the frequency with which the services are utilized. Ex. is there a change in conversations about careers? Is the student becoming more autonomous? What demonstrates that they have become a better student?
- Gustav suggested changes to the graphic illustration, because the words are too small within the bubble.
- Domenico motioned to approve and Matthew seconded the motion. The motion was carried by all members in favor, apart from one abstention. None were opposed.

III. Discuss GenEd reports and recommendations: patterns, outliers?

-

- Committee members participated in a think, pair and share activity surrounding the homework given the previous week. Members gathered in pairs to discuss their review of former General Education reports and recommendations, and reconvened with the larger group to share their findings.
 - Kristin and Carrie thought of the importance of mindfulness in assessment work--what are we asking the data to do? How can we be frugal and simple with our sample in order to minimize data waste?
 - Matthew noticed different areas are specifically connected to a particular class and/or domain.
 - Phil reflected on how there are some missing connections between program outcomes and course-level outcomes. In the Natural Sciences Report- What do we do across natural sciences? What do we all talk about?.
 - Yev and Michael asked us to consider the audience to whom these reports are speaking? When we make recommendations, who are the levers for change? Is it a classroom decision? An administrative decision? What's the strategy to move/change it? Also, which of these recommendations were accomplished and which were not?
 - Paul expressed that sometimes these goals make more sense at a discipline-specific level rather than the General Education level.
 - Gustav praised the professional quality of Phil's Natural Science report and expressed interest in publishing this and similar work. Other committee members raised the issue about IRB approval, and that a different statement of consent may be necessary on future assessments if we plan to pursue publication of our work.
 - Erica wants the committee to look at what has worked and diagnose what has not worked in our previous GenEd work and use the success moving forward.

IV. Discuss structural priorities for future committee work, organizational possibilities

- Erica decided to table this discussion for a future meeting.

V. Homework

- Erica asked the committee to continue reflecting on the list of recommendations from past reports and consider how, based on what we've learned from that, we might consider restructuring General Education goals and SLOs to better capture evidence of learning that could be measured in ALL of our General Education classes (and so, for all students who have a GenEd experience).

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

These minutes were approved by ----- and seconded by -----



Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning),Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst),Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 9/18/2019 (Approved)

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Terrance Hopson-Administration</i> <i>Yev Lapik - Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack - Humanities and Music</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Camelia Salajejan - Math</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phillip Vargas - Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Paul Wandless- Art & Architecture</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i></p> <p>Honored Guest <i>Vincent Wiggins</i></p>		<p>Agenda:</p> <p>I. Review, approve minutes from 9/11</p> <p>II. Quick update about Erica's first meeting with Admin</p> <p>III. Update from Carrie and Kristin about potential assessment grants</p> <p>IV. Data protocol from Fernando and Gustav</p> <p>V. Discussion about possible reformulations of our GenEd Goals and SLOs (this was your homework)*</p> <p>VI. Homework</p>
--	--	---

Erica- Called the meeting to order at 3:00pm

I. Review, approve minutes from 9/11

- Motioned by Michael , seconded by Loretta. Approved by acclamation.

II. Quick update about Erica's first meeting with Admin

- Vicent Wiggins was a guest to discuss the results of the Mon 9/16 meeting between Erica, VP Duarte, and himself. At this time Erica has no new information from him about the possible

changes in relation to release time for the assessment committee. However, Erica wants to know what to expect for Spring 2019; should the assessment committee start strategizing.

- Vincent highlighted that enrollment is playing a critical role in the budget in general, not just the assessment committee's release time at HW but release time across the district. Vincent also mentioned that the assessment committee release time is different from the other City Colleges and for this reason the committee should continue to have conversations to justify the need for release time. Additionally, Vincent mentioned that the higher-ups were thinking of possibly implementing a stipend system moving forward. Lastly, he mentioned that release time is causing the increased need for onboarding adjuncts to cover courses full-time faculty would otherwise be teaching.
- Erica insisted that a stipend would not cover the extra time faculty use to do the work, which is why most faculty have strongly preferred course release to stipend.
- Todd wanted to remind us that other City Colleges may have less release than we do, but they also likely have less output than us, and CCC has sometimes entertained conversations about how to bring the other colleges up to the same standard as HW in assessment work.
- Kristin suggested that we might want to change our committee name to the Learning Assessment committee because it's important to emphasize that this work is supporting learning, so cuts to our work is cutting learning and opportunities for us to understand how students learn.
- Carrie pointed out that comparatively onboarding a single person would cost just the same as continuing the current system.
- Phil noted, using data, that it would cost approximately \$50 less for an adjunct to take the class over due to a full-timer getting release rather than paying the full-timer a stipend--a negligible difference. Stipends are paid \$35/hour to full-timers. 6 hours of work (for 3 credit hours of release) x 16 weeks at \$35/hour=\$3360.00 for the full-timer getting release. The average adjunct contract pays \$941 per credit hour, plus fringe benefits. So \$1,105 is the rate per credit hour paid to adjuncts. \$1,105 x 3 credit hours=\$3315.00 to pay the adjunct to teach the class that's no longer covered by the full-timer getting release. The difference between the full-timer getting a stipend at \$3360 and the adjunct getting paid to teach a class in lieu of a full-timer getting release at approximately \$3315 is \$45, a negligible amount that doesn't seem to adequately explain the strong administrative preference for stipends in lieu of release time.
Phil also mentioned that in 2017, HWC had the lowest number of administrators (22) across district and the largest number of students (11,000+), so the Assessment Committee's work could be viewed as a way to spread administrative work as a real model of meaningful shared governance.
- Terrance commented that the assessment committee work at MX was voluntary (they do have Faculty Project Directors who get release time to work with the accrediting body) and entailed a struggle for participants. They were nervous when it was time for accreditation. Terrance specifically highlighted that criterion level four wasn't in place to the degree it was at HWC when we got reaccredited.

- Bridgette mentioned that the assessment work done through this committee is also valuable in strengthening re-accreditations of programs such as the Business program (which just completed a quality assurance report and will be up for another reaffirmation in 2022) and Child Development program (which will be up for another reaccreditation in 2020).
- Michael reminded us that we will start work for our 4-year institutional re-accreditation visit in 2 years, and assessment work at our institution will continue to be a huge piece, particularly in demonstrating Criterion 4.
- Vincent suggested that VP Kent Lusk may need to attend a future meeting to explain the budgetary rationale. Vincent is planning to meet with Deans and VP September 19, 2019 to talk about release time and later this week to look at budget concerns. Vincent said he'll follow-up as soon as he can with new information.

III. Update from Carrie and Kristin about potential assessment grants

- Carrie and Kristin found a possible grant to bring in outside money in order to temporarily support some of our assessment work: [Collaborative Research Grants](#) from the NEH. The NEH grant is a publication grant worth \$250,000 over three years (maximum of \$100,000 per year). The application due date is 12/4. The aim of the grant is collaborative research. The main deliverable would be a book (tentatively titled "Learning in the Loop"), written by assessment committee members of the past and present regarding the experience and work of assessment. The deadline for the book proposal with the two possible publishers that Kristinn has already identified (Stylus--the first choice; and Joseey-Bass--the second choice) is November 1, 2019. For the next 2 weeks, interested committee members should meet with Carrie and Kristin in room 1046 from 2-3pm on Wednesday 9/25 and Wednesday 10/2 to discuss questions and possibilities for the monograph.
- Carrie has been looking at comparative books. There are not a lot by and for community colleges. We could be a kind of hub for assessment (like ION) for Illinois.
- Kristin will also audio record the individual meetings with assessment committee members' permission and emphasized that once a core group of writers is identified, the deadlines for the publishing houses and institutions offering grants are hard and fast.
- After those 2-3 PM exploratory meetings on 9/25 and 10/2, Erica wants to schedule a full committee vote about the grant opportunity. Erica also wants to make it clear that the grant monies are supporting the assessment committee work and not becoming the center of the work.
- Michael commented that the committee has massive amounts of quality stories to share from over the years and this could be a great opportunity to make our work more noticeable. Our work is unusual and the stories are exciting as long as we stay focused on the purpose to improve student learning and not just be obsessed with assessment for its own sake

V. Data protocol from Fernando and Gustav

- Fernando and Gustav presented the group with guidelines for requesting data collection. Some are practical regarding how to format the excel files containing raw data (rows should correspond to students with student IDs as the first column) and others are about the guiding questions and process of conducting analysis. Fernando pointed out that being as specific as possible in the request can speed up the process and vagueness can make it challenging.

- Carrie commented to make sure to add something more explicit about how SLOs and our questions about student learning relative to those SLOs should drive the design of the assessment tool. Erica will edit that and then distribute it to the committee electronically.
- Vincent questioned if this is shared with faculty in general and thought it to be useful.

IV. Discussion about possible reformulations of our GenEd Goals and SLOs (this was your homework)*

- Yev wanted to reiterate the important question that we need to be clear on who is supposed to follow the recommendations?
- Michael agreed, commenting that if GenEd Goals and SLOs are about changing and improving student learning, how are we following up on those recommendations? Where does it get to face faculty? When does it turn into knowledge and application, and where is the change going to happen?
- Camelia expressed that there should be a mission statement and goals for departments too.
- Erica explained the GenEds are designed for program level/department or discipline and that there is a way to have goals across the board.
- Kristin mentioned that in the English department they can assess effective communication SLOs at the same time that any other GenEd outcome is being assessed if that assessment tool involves student writing. They don't necessarily need a separate writing sample created only for an effective writing assessment? We should focus on existing data being used as a more economical practice.
- Paul expressed that there are some parts that work and that don't work in the Humanities Assessment. This is in part to how are the areas being assessed are grouped. And he suggested to look at cohorts or areas that work together within Humanities and AFA Degrees. One cohort could be a set of liberal arts courses. Another cohort could be the fine & performing arts (Studio Art, Music, Theater). These groupings are more apples to apples instead of apples to fish.
- Domenico suggested to have two categories: department and institutional because some of these seem more applicable to specific departments.
- Yev passed out General Education SLOs from University of Michigan for everyone to review as another example to consider.

VI. Homework

- **Before our next meeting on 9/25 at 3 PM**, please review the following **two questions** as they relate to our list of General Education Goals (attached).
- You may pick a single Gen-Ed Goal and its SLOs as your focus in order to respond to these questions:
- **Prompt Background:** Based on what we learned from several of our previous GenEd assessments, we are considering restructuring General Education goals and SLOs to better capture evidence of learning that could be measured in ALL of our General Education (GECC) classes (and so, for all students who have a GenEd experience).
- **1)** So, looking at this particular GenEd Goal and SLOs, what are the parts of this goal & its accompanying SLOs that seem to most widely apply across the GenEd (GECC) courses*? (In other words, what aspects of learning should we expect to find evidence for if we were to measure it in ALL of our GenEd courses)?
- **2)** What other units of study (such as a series of courses, disciplines, departments within HWC) might be a more appropriate place to utilize these SLOS (either in their current state or with minor revisions)?

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 pm.

These minutes were approved by ----- and seconded by -----



Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning),Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst),Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 9/25/2019 (Not Approved)

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Yev Lapik - Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack - Humanities and Music</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Camelia Salajejan - Math</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phillip Vargas - Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jennifer Vogel- Advising</i> <i>Paul Wandless- Art & Architecture</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p><u>Honored Guest</u></p>		<p>I. Approve minutes</p> <p>II. Discuss GenEd Goals/SLO revisions (reflections from homework, building toward a first draft)</p> <p>III. Any other business</p> <p>IV. Homework</p>
---	--	--

Erica- Called the meeting to order at 3:00pm

I. Review, approve minutes from 9/18

- Motioned by *Domenico*, seconded by *Jeffrey*. Approved by acclamation.

II. Assessment Grants (Carrie & Kristin)/ Updates from Dean Wiggins

- Erica reminded the committee about the meetings with Carrie and Kristin, and encouraged all interested individuals to attend 10/2/2019 at 2-3pm

- Erica informed the committee that she has not heard back from Dean Wiggins and also the initial plan to have conversations about reconstructing the committee is held-off until there is more concrete information available.
- III. Discuss GenEd Goals/SLO revisions (reflections from homework, building toward a first draft)
- Preliminary deadline state of the college meeting is 10/11/2019. The committee must decide if we want to present the changes to general education goals/SLOs at this meeting.
 - Erica created posters around the room with all the current general education goals/SLOs written on them. She tasked the committee to either review all the general educational goals/SLOs or a specific set and make comments, suggestions and/or concerns in a pseudo-silent discussion.
 - The assessment members all went around the room for about 30 minutes giving their written input and having verbal small group conversations. The members reassembled to discuss their ideas collectively
 - The results:
 - Yev suggested to move towards core assessment outcomes as we think about the reformation of SLOs.
 - Carrie agrees that there is some form of connectedness across the board and there should be some form of connection of ideas from each department.
 - Camelia commented to include unit liaisons in the process. She also highlighted that communication is an area that is applicable across disciplines; students must communicate in math and equally in other areas.
 - Bridgette added qualitative reasoning and communication applies to business at the unit level as well.
 - Michael commented that we should focus on a strategy to look at core capacity and activist learning and the fact that we want students to leave the program with a sense of agency. We can then itemize and drill it down.
 - Domenico inquired more about how the current categories were devised and to what extent are we committed to these.
 - Carrie gave some insight as to how the categories were created: the general education requirement courses were at the center of the original formation.
 - Erica reiterated the task at hand is to determine how to move forward with general educational goals/SLOs and that we are “blowing up” the current Goals and categories, so we are not committed to keeping them as they are.
 - Todd commented that the current set of GenEd Goals has educational units (Natural Science, Quantitative Reasoning, Social Science, and Humanities & Arts); Proficiencies/Applications/Tools (Critical Thinking, Information Literacy and Computer Literacy); and Behaviors/Attitudes (Diversity, Civic Engagement). Does it make sense to leave the educational units within the department or disciplinary educational unit for assessment and focus on the proficiencies and behaviors/attitudes that cut across all the disciplines for GenEd?
 - Paul liked Todd’s idea but also feels AFA’s aren’t only for general education degrees. The program is also for non-degree seeking individuals therefore a model of one-size-fits all is inapplicable. Paul also mentioned it might be best to keep academic based and non-academic program SLOs separate.
 - Erica commented that general education goals should be the ones that do cut across the range of courses we teach.
 - Jeffrey added that each year the assessment committee made adjustments to SLOs individually and this year is the first time the committee is looking at all the SLOs collectively. He also agreed with including unit liaisons in the process of reformation.
 - Matthew included that looking at all the SLOs on the wall, he was able to see some commonality, for example: technique is something people have to master whether

that's figuring out how to master an art technique or figuring out how to construct a sentence. They both require special techniques and tools to do so. Is it possible to include language about technique that would fit both?

- Erica said we need a clear way to articulate a general educational experience and definition.
- Jennifer wanted to know why we have general education for degrees not meant for transfer purposes (like AAS in Child Development or Architecture)? She also gave a specific example that students in child development program can enter the workforce as soon as they are done with their degree.
- Carrie commented that GenEd can be for preparing students for the workforce as well, not solely for transfer.
- Bridgette commented that transfer students for business program must complete a core number of classes in order to transfer to most business programs but they are not included as part of general education courses. She also said it speaks volumes to how we define general education courses.

IV. Any other business

- Jeff has finished drafting the Quantitative Reasoning Report. It will be brought to the committee soon.

V. Homework

- Consider what you would rate as your top (or at least one of your top) GenEd Goal for our students (if you have SLOs for it in mind, then that's doubleplusgood). This can be a GenEd Goal that we already have if you think it should still be maintained at the GenEd level, or it can be a GenEd Goal based on something that doesn't already have its own GenEd category in our current framework but that you think all our students should be expected to do by the time they complete their GenEd experience with us (remembering that that consists of a different number of GenEd courses, depending on whether they're completing the AA, AS, AFA, AGS, AAS, or no degree at all).
- Consider one GenEd Goal you would like us to discuss, refine, and possibly even tackle as our first GenEd assessment on our new work-in-progress model. Most importantly, let's always stay focused on what we expect students to be able to do after their GenEd experience, and that should lead us to consider what evidence of student learning we can imagine looking for in order to assess that learning? When we meet on Wed 10/2, we'll see how many different ideas people have in mind, and maybe that will help us think about how to give shape to the larger array of Goals.

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.

Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning), Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst), Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 10/2/2019 (Approved)

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Terrance Hopson-Administration</i> <i>Yev Lapik - Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack - Humanities and Music</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Camelia Salajejan - Math</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phillip Vargas - Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Paul Wandless- Art & Architecture</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i></p> <p><u>Honored Guest</u> <i>Vincent Wiggins</i></p>		<p>Agenda: I. Review, approve minutes from 9/25 II. Administrative update/status report II. List, discuss, prioritize new GenEd Goals (this will build on your homework, which was identifying ONE General Education goal that you think would be a good priority and starting point for our new GenEd assessment project). III. Update on Quantitative Reasoning Report (see link below)--please review it so we can discuss it 10/8 IV. Homework</p>
---	--	---

Erica- Called the meeting to order at 3:01pm

I. Review, approve minutes from 9/25

- Motioned by *Mike* , seconded by *Kristin* . Approved by acclamation

II. Administrative update/status report

- Monday 10/7/2019 meeting with Vice President to continue conversation about the future of assessment committee.
- Vincent said he will not be in attendance but will phone in.

- Erica's immediate concern is how to submit the paperwork for special assignment, specifically if she should submit the paperwork according to the current system. Vincent said to assume we have the same positions and amount of release time for Spring 2020 as we do currently so we should submit the special assignment forms under that assumption.

II. List, discuss, prioritize new GenEd Goals (this will build on your homework, which was identifying ONE General Education goal that you think would be a good priority and starting point for our new GenEd assessment project).

- Erica asked committee members to write and submit their top priority for a general education goal to focus on so that the assessment committee can narrow down focus on next semester. The goal should be one that you feel can be assessed across the board.
- List of general education goals criteria submitted by meeting attendees*:
 - Effective Communication 5 (+3)
 - Critical Thinking skills 6 (+1)
 - Activist Learning 1
 - Human Diversity 1
 - Civic Engagement 2
 - Quantitative Reasoning 2
 - Rhetorical Knowledge 1
 - Inquiry & Analysis 1
 - Information Literacy 1
 - Computer Literacy 1
 - Writing Across Curriculum 1
 - Computer Literacy 1
 - Oral Communication 1
 - *these criteria can be reorganized in numerous ways to combine, subsume, etc. This is not an organized list, just an initial sense of our top interests.
- Erica then wanted everyone to think about what stands out and does not fit in at the general education level. She asked everyone to decide if these goals should be grouped or identify which ones we should start focusing on.
- Yev commented that quantitative reasoning should still be a general education goal even though it didn't receive a large number of votes.
- Erica reassured Yev that this list does not reflect the total list of goals that committee members think are important; this list is just based on the "top" priority of each person, so quantitative reasoning may still be on a majority of members' lists, just not at the pinnacle of everyone's list.
- Carrie mentioned that critical thinking was removed from the list years ago but we can see that people continue to value it.
- Phil commented that quantitative reasoning is very similar to analysis and interpretation.
- Kristin suggested and created a complex venn diagram to highlight the overlapping of some of the general education goals: rhetorical knowledge, effective communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, inquiry and analysis, and information literacy. She also said it reminded her of the restructured placement exam that allowed students to self-place based on previous education and experience, goals and scores. She also thought computer literacy should be taken off the list.
- Paul wanted to clarify this meeting's goals for future assessment tools: is it to prioritize general education goals and still have separate tools to assess them, or create one assessment that several rubrics could be applied to assess multiple goals from one tool. The latter being a more efficient use of time and maximizing time and energy of the committee.
- Erica acknowledged that it is messy right now and said the goal is to look at multiple possibilities until we narrow it down to one goal to focus on and/or a framework of many goals that will shape our GenEd approach moving forward.

- Carrie made a statement that the overall question is what are we all invested in to make sure our students accomplish across the board.
- Erica reiterated, regardless of which GenEd courses are taken, what do we want students to accomplish is the overarching theme.
- Todd believes technology should be included because students lack proper computer literacy skills, such as how to attach a document to an email, which are foundational for their future education and careers.
- Kristin commented we should not focus so much on computer literacy because teachers can embed a tutorial in the course.
- Yev agreed that there is an ethical responsibility for computer literacy but it is a soft skill.
- Jeffrey commented that maybe instructors should begin to reframe their approach to computers because students are using handheld devices more so than the ancient desktop.
- Dave suggested that the focus should begin from a list of objectives instead of concrete general education goals and create a standard of questions, for example, do students know how to attach a document? First get the information we need and then we'll know how to form the assessment goals: the questions and student answers should inform the goals. This also confirms that authentic assessment can be a part of the bigger picture.
- Kristin agrees there should be a way to capture everything.
- Carrie commented that the goal should be to devise general education goals that instructors across departments and programs can equally use. Also, the committee should seek data and use the data to create next steps. Real time assessment is a different approach.
- Loretta said this is a case of closing the loop because general education courses are required courses that must be taken to get an AA or AS, however information literacy isn't one of those courses.
- Carrie interjected that general education assessment is not just limited to the disciplines specified in course titles. Computer/Digital literacy could still be a general education goal even if there isn't a required computer literacy course that everyone is required to take. Gen Ed should be something we all agree on and should be outcome driven; it does not have to be discipline specific.
- Domenico commented that the conversation is on unstable ground and that at this point there are no fundamental categories. We are looking at core competencies and the general education assessment should be general enough to have applicability across most course offerings. There are standardized items that should be broader categories by redefining and reestablishing criteria for general education. Maybe a list with primary and secondary criteria.
- Erica agrees that as of now the process might be unorthodox because the assessment committee is attempting to do something that has never been done before. The committee must consider how some general education goals are connected--the initial list created at the beginning of today's meeting is by no means the finished draft. There are certainly other approaches to this process that may work better in a more linear orientation.
- Kristin commented that from a research standpoint, we must consider what we value and what students can do and use that to figure out how are we going to assess them.
- Jeffrey said maybe we should have more than one model and had an idea to work in smaller groups to help mediate some of the challenges.
- Mike said the problem with the current model we follow is that it is become itemized and the list has gotten longer and unwieldy. The goal should be to intersect disciplines or maybe an interdisciplinary approach .

III. Update on Quantitative Reasoning Report (see link below)--please review it so we can discuss it 10/8

IV. Homework

As a reminder, your homework was to review the Quantitative Reasoning report (thanks again to Jeff and Fernando for their work on that). The link is here:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mE7c3gu8bA1Ks1tqbtUdXbDIYC4E_0zcnRLI6mAmd6M/edit?usp=sharing

Please make suggested edits in the document itself and bring larger questions or suggestions to our discussion this Wednesday so we can move toward a vote to approve and finalize it

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 pm.

These minutes were approved by ----- and seconded by -----



Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning),Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst),Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 10/9/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Yev Lapik - Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Erica McCormack - Humanities and Music</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Camelia Salajejan - Math</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Paul Wandless- Art & Architecture</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Language/ELL</i></p> <p>Honored Guest <i>Ukaisha Al-Amin</i></p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Agenda</p> <p>I. Review, approve minutes from 10/2</p> <p>II. Admin update--special assignments, state of the college</p> <p>III. Review, approve (?) QR report</p> <p>IV. Reshaping GenEd Discussion: models to consider from Todd and Dave</p> <p>V. Any Other Business</p> <p>VI. Homework</p>
---	--	--

Erica- Called the meeting to order at 3:01pm

I. Review, approve minutes from 10/2/2019

- Motioned by Yev, seconded by Domenico. Approved by acclamation

II. Admin update--special assignments, state of the college

- Erica had another meeting with Vice President to inform her about the assessment committee's work. Also, Erica will submit Mike's report and QR report to the Vice President once they're both finalized and approved. VP Duarte committed to taking the recommendations from the reports up through the Cabinet and administration. Erica asks that if any members of the committee have questions or concerns that they want brought up in the meetings with the VP and Dean, please let her know.

- Erica received approval from Vincent to submit special assignments for the spring semester, therefore look out for an email from Jeff soon because the paperwork is due immediately.
- Carrie and Jeff will attend the IUPUI Assessment Institute next week, so there is a possibility that they won't be attending next week's meeting. Carrie sent out a survey for everyone to complete, that shouldn't take very long to complete. They have a 60 minute slot to present the information about assessment as a form of professional development. This is an aspect of our work that we have highlighted to various administrators (past and present) to demonstrate the relationship between assessment and professional development, especially at the unit liaison level.

III. Review, approve (?) QR report

The assessment committee provided feedback and asked questions about the QR report:

- Mike commented that 90% of students believe the process was complicated but 93% believe persistence is the key to success. Mike also suggested that when we disseminate the reports, we highlight two take-aways according to each audience.
- Erica recommended that, based on our findings, we recommend that our local administration be more conscious of graphical information and ensure we are representing it responsibly so that we don't perpetrate the examples of providing misleading data.
- Jennifer realized that from an advising standpoint she can now discuss with students why taking statistics is important.
- Kristin commented that maybe the issue is instructors don't know how to teach QR, so we should recommend professional development opportunities around interpreting data in misleading graphical representations. Additionally, Kristin suggested a side-by-side comparison of the graph being used in the introduction and suggested a "to learn more" link be added. Kristin suggested the take-aways be sent to Bernadette so that she can add it to the weekly announcements.
- Fernando explained that misrepresentation can be unintentional or a mistake.
- Gustav wanted to know who is the target audience ?
 - Several members chimed in: primary stakeholders include faculty, advisors, administrators
- Jeff asked everyone to take another look at the report and send other recommendations to Jeff.
- Carrie suggested to reinforce the connectedness to the earlier QR report (such as similar findings around students struggling with percentages)
- Kristin asked Ukaisha how this report would be beneficial to her as a person that's new to the assessment committee. Ukaisha said that it'll be great to use as professional development for individuals trying to navigate City Colleges as a new tenure-track teacher.
- These findings and recommendations should be incorporated into adjunct faculty orientation as well as shared with tenure-track faculty in particular.

IV. Reshaping GenEd Discussion: models to consider from Todd and Dave

- Todd and Dave will present ideas about how to approach the General Education restructuring. Erica reiterated to keep in mind that there are a range of possibilities, so we don't have to keep the current model.
- Todd's slides are being shared with the committee via email.
- Dave presented his ideas for reshaping the General Education model and process. The link to the PowerPoint was shared with committee members via email. He emphasized that the

current 6-stage process works really well for our smaller, unit-level work (for situations when students are coming in with relatively equal lack of familiarity), but it is has not been a perfect fit for GenEd due to the fact that we don't have people coming into that GenEd learning in the same place. His suggestion featured rhyming, intersecting capabilities (so that every discipline has a role or is subject to each of the capabilities; we are all invested in all of them) rather than siloed "competencies." He introduced his idea for us to investigate capabilities, by which is mean the opportunities and possibilities that exist (or not) for students to enrich their abilities in these central areas and the hope that, if we do, we just might stumble into a measure/finding of student learning (or a change we can make that positively impacts student learning). For now, the capabilities are paired with outcomes derived from the AACU Value rubrics (<https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics>). He envisions a process where we start with questions, then investigate our findings and interpretation of those findings to lead to additional questions or to action-item proposals.

V. Any Other Business

- As an aside, Todd requested that anyone with Open Educational Resources they share with students send him those links so he can add them to the Library Pathfinder.

VI. Homework

- Committee members should review the QR report for final approval.
- Committee members should also review the slides from Todd and Dave for further conversation about their ideas around restructuring GenEd.

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

These minutes were approved by ----- and seconded by -----



Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning),Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst),Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 10/16/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Yev Lapik - Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack - Humanities and Music</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jennifer Vogel- Advising</i> <i>Paul Wandless- Art & Architecture</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p>Honored Guest <i>Vincent Wiggins- Office of Instruction</i></p>		<p>Agenda I. Review, approve minutes from 10/9 II. Announcements III. Reshaping GenEd Discussion: continue to consider models from Todd and Dave (30 mins) IV. Review, approve (?) QR report (10 mins) V. Carrie and Kristin introduce book project (10 mins) VI. Any Other Business VII. Homework</p>
--	--	--

Erica- Called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm

I. Review, approve minutes from 10/9/2019

- Motioned by *Carrie*, seconded by *Loretta* . Approved by majority, with one abstention.

II. Announcements:

- Thanks to Carrie and Jeffrey for their IUPUI presentation (more info will be shared soon); more thanks to Jeffrey for managing special assignments. There will be changes in a couple liaison/coordinator roles for Spring 2020. Thanks to Domenico for serving as liaison to Social

and Applied Sciences; Ingrid Riedle will take over the role next semester. Thanks to Yev Lapik for serving as liaison to Biology; Farah Movahedzadeh will take over the role next semester. Thanks to Michael Heathfield for serving as coordinator of Co-Curricular Assessment; Jennifer Vogel will take over the role next semester.

- Fall *Assessment Times* will be coming out this semester. Members should take time to think about what they want to say, even those not receiving release time for this because the assessment committee could always use the extra insights. The main deliverable for the unit liaisons in the fall is the *Assessment Times* article, and the deadline is November 1, 2019

III. Reshaping GenEd Discussion: continue to consider models from Todd and Dave (30 mins)

- Todd's ideas around reshaping the general education model:
 - Todd's powerpoint was sent to members last week to view and develop questions and/or comments. Todd explained that his ideas are ways to conceptualize or organize according to how the committee has been talking about general education goals over time. The objectives and outcomes can exist at different levels: the unit or department level, the general education level, and fundamental skills. Some concepts fit more naturally as a general education item (ex. capstone project), whereas other concepts or objectives (like social science, humanities) align more closely with the department or unit level ; and finally some skills can be classified at the foundational level (ex. information literacy or computer literacy). These can be divided into hierarchical levels or segments; however, all of the levels and segments impact student learning and success. After all, skills build on skills.
 - Paul liked Dave's idea of starting with asking questions. He liked the idea of a tool that works across programs and the idea of including colleagues in the inquiry process to gather a variety of questions to have a variety of perspectives.
 - Erica thought the inquiry process should start with everyone involved, including students and faculty.
 - Yev thought it might be useful to use the former recommendations to form the questions at the inquiry level.
 - Domenico liked the idea of transforming our current GenEd categories into central capabilities. with a secondary section illustrating how those central capabilities pertain to each unit or how the disciplines contribute to those capabilities.
 - Mike highlighted the importance of consulting with faculty and understanding what they want students to learn and engage in an inquiry process that's not driven by outcomes There's a problem with asking faculty what we expect students to know and do when they leave.
 - Carrie commented that the inquiry process has been driven by outcomes in the past but now we need questions to build the inquiry process and build equity and culturally-responsive assessment practices. We once used proprietary tests but have largely rejected them because we often felt like they were not relevant to our students and their strengths. The unit level/ program level is much closer to students and has more opportunity to bring student voice into the conversation. This is an opportunity to honor and include student voices in the process.
 - Kristin said the conversations need to be happening within the department too. Specifically, within the English department, are our SLOs culturally-responsive? Maybe not if they're still in place from 1998. Students need to be multi-modal, so we need to show them different ways of making their own work accessible to people with low vision, hearing disabilities, etc. It's worth asking at all levels (departmental, institutional) what relationships we have with DAC and how we are being responsive to 21st century needs--are we assessing things that matter?.
 - Carrie mentioned that before we switched to an online format for our tools, we sent all our tools to the DAC to be converted into braille, large print, etc. When we switched to

digital mode, we've been operating on the assumption that the LMS made the tools accessible, so there has been less explicit partnering with the DAC in our recent assessments

- Bridgette commented that transfer students should also be included because some students engage in internships and gain skills that are useful when they transfer or go out into the workforce. Since the degree or certificate attests to different skill sets, we may want to incorporate advising and internship perspective.
- Carrie mentioned that there is interesting work around 21st century skills (problem-solving, collaborating, etc.) that we can look to. For specific skills, we'll deal with those at the program/discipline/unit level.
- Dave took one of the elements of his proposed model, "Participate" as an example. If we were to follow this model and ask questions about that goal, such as "how do students registered at the DAC encounter opportunities to participate or not?" and "Do you know how to take advantage of these opportunities, or not?" and also asking faculty questions like "how are you guaranteeing access." The Inquiry step is the beginning of the process, and maybe we never get to a step where we build a measure about this, but we could find that this is a policy problem, an awareness problem, so then we could have a structure to hand off these issues to different teams that could work to address those problems. General education assessment about things like Humanities or Social Science would be pushed down to the unit level, while also exploring a new process. If HLC comes out. we can point them to unit level for assessment information and data while we use this new process to find out more about Gen Ed.
- Carrie commented that the HLC requires the committee to know what we they are doing, have stated outcomes and know where the outcomes live. Carrie also said that if we explore this new model that's less about backwards-design and more about inquiry, then everything must be beefed-up and reinforced at the department/discipline/unit level.
- Mike reiterated that we will be doing another full report in just 4 years for HLC. The model used is up to the committee as long as there are student learning outcomes. We're using assessment as a frame of reference stil.
- Kristin suggested that we consider running a pilot with changes while simultaneously running the current system and later evaluate the pilots to determine how they work and which yield the best results. If we have a way to evaluate the processes systematically, they can maybe be conducted simultaneously. Then we can tell HLC that we're working to meet the needs of the HWC community, being thoughtful, responsive, and this is the tool we're using to evaluate.
- Paul commented that he is currently running a similar model in his program, unintentionally, taking a Humanities outcome and applying it to a studio art classes. His art classes are reading an aesthetics article (philosophy of art) using philosophy protocols supplied by Dave to act as resources to read philosophy. So the humanities outcome applied to GenEd students for a humanities tool was being used in the studio class.
- Loretta emphasized that it's important to consider the history of how the current GenEd categories came about and consider how faculty participation and approval needs to be involved.
- Dave reminded us of an important difference between the early 2000s when the current set of GenEd goals were drafted. At that point, faculty were doing advising, so the fact that all the GenEd categories map onto degrees made sense in that context. But the context has shifted because faculty are no longer doing that magnitude of advising, so it's not as intuitive to faculty.

IV. Review, approve (?) QR report (10 mins)

- Motioned by *Kristin* , seconded by *Carrie* . Approved by acclamation.
- Erica will send the updated report with changes via email

V. Carrie and Kristin introduce book project (10 mins)

- Two ways to assist
 - Kristin will send out the near complete draft but wanted to give everyone the opportunity to give feedback in two ways by either checking the grammar and/or providing feedback.. This can be done by turning on the suggesting function within the document.
 - If you have an eye for a particular subject you want to explore and write, talk more with Kristin and Carrie, and mark your name on a comment linked to that section
- Aim to give feedback between now and 10/23/2019. Erica will send the draft via email.
- November 1st the draft will be sent to the publisher.
-
- Carrie will be a primary writer, but other parts of the text could even be structured as interviews. The budget for the book project will include copy-editing and indexing services so that those tasks don't fall to a committee member.
- Carrie mentioned that she saw the audience for this book at IUPUI conference. The memory of the committee is not contained in any one person, so this is an opportunity to coordinate these memories.

VI. Any Other Business

- not today!

VII. Homework

- Next meeting the committee will determine if the committee wants to endorse the book project headed by Kristin and Carrie and or keep it separate from the committee work.

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.



Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning),Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst),Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 10/23/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Camelia Salajejan- Mathematics</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jennifer Vogel- Advising</i> <i>Paul Wandless- Art & Architecture</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p>Honored Guest Ukaisha Al-Amin Likwan Cheng</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Agenda</p> I. Review, approve minutes from 10/16 II. Announcements/admin updates (5 mins) III. Reflection from Carrie and Jeffrey on IUPUI presentation and reception-(10 mins) IV. Carrie and Kristin book project discussion (20 mins) V. Reshaping GenEd Discussion: proposed "Capabilities" model (20 mins) VI. Any Other Business (5 mins) VII. Homework
--	--	---

Jeff - Called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm

I. Review, approve minutes from 10/9/2019

- Motioned by *Loretta*, seconded by *Mike*. Approved by majority.

II. Announcements:

- Jeff and Erica met with the Vice President. During the meeting the Quantitative Reasoning report was shared. Jeff updated her on the committee's conversation in regards to the QR

report. During the meeting they also discussed Jeff's and Carrie's presentation at the IUPUI assessment institute.

III. Reflection from Carrie and Jeffrey on IUPUI presentation and reception

- Jeff: People were amazed at the increased administrative investment in the committee over the years.
- Carrie: Assessment Institute in Indianapolis is next year and HWAC should plan to attend and present; assessment committee members should think about this and keep this on their radar.
- Carrie continued on to highlight key points from the presentation she and Jeff presented: the highlight focused on how being involved with the assessment committee is a form of professional development. In regards to infrastructure the more novice individual may struggle with the concepts around assessment; however, in the spirit of learning the individual continues to grow regardless of fears and challenges. Leadership is another area that is strengthened through interacting on the HWAC. Members grow and take on leadership roles as they transition into new positions. Building release time and compensation is a critical component and aids in the success of the committee. Individuals that don't become members even learn a lot from attending the meetings. Carrie discussed in depth that assessment is a developmental process and that learning also occurs within the context of being with colleagues and getting to know each other.
- Assessment times are due 11/1/19- this is the main deliverable for unit liaisons.

IV. Carrie and Kristin book project discussion

- Gustav: the book is great coming from a two year institution. Four year institutions focus on their fields of research. This book can be used as more of a guideline.
- Carrie: there aren't many books available with the topics or resources presented in this proposed book, especially coming from community colleges about the subject of assessment.
- Mike: inquired about the targeted audience and wanted to know if there's an identified market because it is important that the book is able to sell.
- Jeff made a motion to have the book endorsed by the assessment committee, Mike seconded it.

V. Reshaping GenEd Discussion: proposed "Capabilities" model

- Dave: split the original idea he presented earlier into different categories that will possibly generate very different aims. The general education outcomes might take a little more time to develop and reshape, also introducing the inquiry process might influence the general education outcomes. Proposal one is the inquiry process, what questions do we have for all those involved, sift through the responses and determine the connection. The connections made will either lead to more questions or possibly lead to general education outcomes. Pilot the inquiry process in the spring, while unit liaisons continue to implement the six step procedure that is currently in place for general education guidelines.
- Mike: We can implement two parallel processes.
- Dave: Faculty typically will respond to surveys if they are short and they believe the information will connect to them. Additionally, the committee should find out how Jennifer Asimow got the responses she did in the past to engage faculty, because the response rate was great.
- Jeff: the assessment committee has a solid reputation amongst faculty to keep it short, therefore the inquiry questions should be short and right to the point.
- Paul: the unit liaisons can take inquiry questions to their respective departments, those not represented will be contacted by an assessment committee member, and finally those that may not have responded to either of these will have contact from the committee collectively.

- Dave: Do we want to move forward with the pilot or put into subcommittee?
- Camelia: Initially Dave proposed the ideas to work on both; reshaping the General Education Goals and the inquiry process.
- Dave: We might end up doing double work if the committee work on both. If we work on proposal one maybe we will find connections to objectives and student learning outcomes and use this information to reshape General Education goals.
- Mike: It is a good strategy to engage more people and simultaneously the subcommittee can do the work, so that we can work on both.
- Dave: we don't want to send questions out about student learning outcomes and general education objectives because they are very different. People will respond to the questions that fit within their disciplines.
- Carrie: When sending out the questionnaire don't use the word assessment.
- Dave: We're gathering data about student learning, that may or may not inform outcomes.
- Jeff: Who wants to be on the subcommittee.

Bridgette Mahan

Jack Whalen

Carrie Nepstad

Gustav Wiberg

Paul Wandless

Domenico Ferri

Camelia Salajeon

Jeffrey Swigart

Adjournment and Approval of These Minutes: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack (Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning), Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst), Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 10/30/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Yev Lapik- Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack- Humanities</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phil Vargas- Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jennifer Vogel- Advising</i> <i>Jack Whalen - Social and Applied Science</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p><u>Honored Guest</u></p>		<p>Agenda I. Review, approve minutes from 10/23 II. Announcements/admin updates III. Online Learning update IV. Book project discussion (V. Subgroups for GenEd "Capabilities" process and model VI. Any Other Business VII. Homework</p>
--	--	--

Erica - Called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm

Agenda

I. Review, approve minutes from 10/23

- Motioned by *Loretta*, seconded by *Dave*. Approved by majority.

II. Announcements/admin updates

- Erica sent the co-curricular report and qualitative reasoning report to the VP, who should send the information to the larger community. Erica also sent the reports to Amelia Tsang, who included them in the "Weekly Announce" email.

- State of the college: Erica may ask to be placed on the agenda for a brief introduction and a quick explanation about the co-curricular and quantitative reasoning reports.
- Regarding questions about the retention meeting, the committee asked various questions regarding how the drop date change implemented this semester affected student enrollment. Jennifer Vogel shared insights from advising about the interplay between drop dates, financial aid verification forms, and effects on enrollment.
- Yev: Presented QR report to the leadership team and it went well. They were curious about the graphs and inquired about the reason so many students postpone taking math until last, and there was a conversation about encouraging students to take math early.
- Erica: is this a question we can use for the inquiry process of Dave's proposal? Great survey question to learn more about math attitudes and views.
- Yev: Math is usually last because students assume they won't do well and don't want to hurt their GPA.
- Kristin: Conflict of schedule (due to large number of credits per math course) could also be a possible reason for this.
- Jennifer: students don't take math until the end because they don't do well on the placement, and instead of using the tutoring services, they just wait as long as possible. Also, the idea of taking three math courses can be intimidating.
- Gustav: How does the grade average out once the student transfer?
- Jennifer: failed courses don't just go away, even if the student later passed it. While the Transfer policies and guidelines are at the college's discretion (they often average the two scores).

III. Online Learning update

- Yev: the title of online learning coordinator isn't the best title for this role anymore since we are already including online sections within our Gen Ed assessments. Maybe the coordinator role should take another name or direction. It's important to remember that we don't seek to compare effectiveness of modalities because it's not possible to have a control group, and there are too many variables that go into students' decisions to take courses in a particular modality.
- Bridgette: At the unit level, the business program thought it might be beneficial to compare online learning versus face-to-face due to concerns of consistency when students take the subsequent face-to-face course. Students from the online community are bringing the same knowledge to the classroom.
- Carrie: be careful with implying causality between face-to-face and online
- Yev: The approaches to teaching and learning are different between online and face-to-face because there is no direct data as to why the learning is different.
- Bridgette: Outside accreditation review student success. Assessment at the end of the term across both modalities; what happens if there are glitches?
- Yev: Maybe the structure should be adjusted but there are no valid studies to compare the two modalities, so it would be beneficial to not distinguish primarily by delivery mode. In other words, all professional development in any academic area should be open to all, regardless of teaching format. Who is going to take a survey of students' attitudes to online courses, who is going to apply recommendations and create a task force to implement recommendations? Just yesterday I had a meeting with Vincent and Meghan Chandler discussed that maybe the title of online learning isn't applicable any more because many students don't exclusively take courses online, it is a mixture of both. We need to stop separating online, hybrid and face-to-face all the time because we have students taking courses in multiple modalities and teachers teaching in multiple modalities too.
- Phil: maybe accessible learning (to also encompass 8-week and 12-week mini-sessions)

- Yev: cautioned against that name since “accessible” is associated with DAC-type accommodations
- Carrie: HLC doesn’t care about the mode. Student learning outcomes are consistent across modalities and assessment strategies should be consistent as well.

Erica: Agenda Adjustment. We’ve raised enough points to formulate questions to get started with Dave’s proposal through subgroups. Maybe even some questions raised today like what factors lead students to delay taking a math course. To confirm, these are the subgroups as I understand them:

Process: Dave, Camelia, Paul, Jack, Erica, Carrie

Model: Domenico, Gustav, Jack, Erica, Carrie

IV. Book project discussion

- Erica: Last week a motion was raised to endorse the book project headed by Kristin and Carrie. Does this mean as a committee we are saying that we see your work, we think it’s great, and we trust you; or do you see yourself playing an active role within this project as a contributor?
- Dave: there is some reluctance because of the demands that’s already placed on the assessment committee and taking on this grant as part of committee work could possibly shift the focus and priorities of the committee. And we’ve never been short on work. Now that we’re trying to develop a new approach to turn out GenEd assessment more quickly, it could make it challenging to do that if we accept NEH funding and the grant crowds out our regular work
- Kirstin: the project was originally sought out to support the committee as a solution to the possible future budget cuts and changes. The idea was to take the work that has already been documented and sending to a publication. She’s aware that the reports that have already been completed can’t be shared due to IRB reasons, but the processes and tools can be used as a teachable moment to people in the broader community.
- Yev: I’m afraid but willing to try.
- Shawntay shared that for an adjunct instructor it seems really useful to be able to access a publication with this information for novice instructors too.
- Gustav: this process is about how to do assessment, to tell a story about how the work is done. How other colleges can establish assessment committees highlighting the bumps and bruises along the way.
- Kristin: NEH grant proposal is due Dec. 4 if we’re doing it.
- Michael: be aware of the purpose of the committee because the book proposal is a lot of work and it is not guaranteed to be published. The book is not the primary work of the committee, this should be separate and distinct from the assessment committee.
- Erica: let’s take another vote for clarity about this, Erica will send an email and everyone should respond by 10/31. Remember, if we relinquish the grant we are at the hands of the administration. The book was the possibility to have more revenue.

Meeting adjourned at 4:07pm

Following the meeting, the proposal about the grant was extended to the committee via email. Of the 19 votes cast, 7 were in favor of pursuing the grant. The remaining 12 votes represented nay votes (also 7), abstentions (4), and one mixed vote (1). As a result of the vote, the committee will not be pursuing this grant as part of its committee work. The book is still being sent to publishers for consideration, but that is separate from the grant.

Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning), Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst), Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 11/6/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Terrance Hopson-Administration</i> <i>Yev Lapik- Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack- Humanities</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phil Vargas- Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jennifer Vogel- Advising</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p><u>Honored Guest</u></p> <p><i>Ukaisha Al-Amin</i></p>		<p>Agenda</p> <p>Agenda I. Review, approve minutes from 10/30 II. Announcements/admin updates (5 mins) III. Assessment Times update (20 mins) IV. Unit Liaison updates (20 mins) V. Any Other Business (5 mins) VI. Homework</p>
--	--	--

Erica - Called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm

Agenda

I. Review, approve minutes from 10/30/2019

- Motioned by *Domenico* seconded by *Yev*. Approved by majority.

II. Announcements/admin updates

- Erica was on the agenda for the November Chairs meeting but missed it because she didn't know she was confirmed to be on the agenda. She is on agenda (and is aware of it) for 12/6/2019, meeting with Vice President. Erica plans to talk about the work of the

assessment committee and reiterated that we would want her help distributing the Assessment times.

- College wide meeting is approaching and Erica can be added to the agenda, but wants to confirm with the committee what she should focus on.
- Paul: Take the opportunity to plant the seed about the new inquiry process and that faculty should expect to hear from their respective unit liaisons.
- Kristin: Make an open call form more faculty to join the committee.

III. Assessment Times update (20 mins)

- Erica: Edits should be done by next week and present final drafts. Make sure when editing other peoples' articles that members are only making suggestions and not directly editing the draft. Please look at the note from the chair since it goes on the first page of the AT: highlight any questions you have and add a brief comment. When it comes to your own article, accept or reject the suggested edits.
- Yev: Would like for someone to review her online piece
- Jeff: General summary of Assessment Times from members and highlighted important aspects of each member's report. So far, they have been short and sweet. Below are his summaries
 - Paul: Has done Art 144, 131, ceramics, now adding 145 as well. It'll be a hands-on plus T/F and Multiple choice structured assessment for 3-D, along the same lines as what's been done for 2-D courses.
 - Yev: For biology Yev has been looking at data from fall 2018 (when Aigerim was the liaison) and thinking about recommendations to address the misconceptions about biology among Bio 121 (for majors) students. One exciting detail is how much involvement she's had from colleagues (all 10 sections participated in the pretest, and 9/10 participated in the posttest).
 - Bridgette: business department has been working on reaccreditation, student learning outcomes for online courses, and transferring to other colleges. Bridgette is focused on her program
 - Kristin: Assessing student work along the English 96/101/102 sequence for rhetorical knowledge and concepts of audience and purpose. She wrote her AT article about the book project. Also included information about how collaboration helps you think.
 - Dave: Humanities and music has been working on student learning outcomes for music business, music tech, music performance, and philosophy. Also, developed a report card for Applied Music students (music performance) for instructors to share with students so students can have a better sense of their development from one semester to the next and so we can all encourage retention. When jury assessment began, we realized they weren't all being tested for sight reading, and now as an ancillary effect of the assessment, they are at 80% being tested for sight reading.
 - Todd: Library moved from direct questions to indirect, affective questions, such as how do you feel about your understanding of the assignment and the process for using search terms.
 - Camelia: Math 140, college algebra. Camelia does a good job getting the math department involved. One approach is she encourages faculty to vote on topics that they want to assess.
 - Samar: Samar looked at Allan's previous assessment work in Chemistry and is writing active learning exercises in chemistry to help improve student learning in areas like stoichiometry.

- Phil: Phil is looking at the Physical Science program, alining SLOs at course level, program level, and Next Generation Science standards. He showcased an elaborate graph (which is called “a graph”) that he is using to trace how student learning outcomes run through from program-level to course-level to activity.
- Domenico: a survey was implemented to assess strengths and areas for growth with civic engagement within the Social and Applied Sciences department. He’s closing the loop by expanding the department mission statement and taking the 5 department SLOs related to Civic Engagement (which go from conceptual to applied knowledge) and encouraging department faculty to add them (as optional SLO additions) to their course syllabi.
- Matthew: focusing on how students acquire specific French vowels using spectrograms and open source software (Praat). Matthew wants assistance in making sure the images are clear in his article. He piloted the system with students and has since streamlined the directions. Erica helped in the earlier stages by serving as the guinea pig for the first draft of student directions.

V. Any Other Business (5 mins)

- Yev: has anyone been successful with meeting online such as zoom or email?
- Carrie: both zoom and email are ways to hold a successful distance meeting that we’ve used in Child Development.
- Erica: will follow up with subgroups via email for the inquiry process.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm

Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning), Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst), Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 11/13/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Terrance Hopson-Administration</i> <i>Yev Lapik- Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack- Humanities</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phil Vargas- Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jennifer Vogel- Advising</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p><u>Honored Guest</u></p> <p><i>Ukaisha Al-Amin</i></p>		<p>Agenda I. Review, approve minutes from 11/6 II. Announcements/admin updates (10 mins) III. Assessment Times update (20 mins) IV. GenEd Subgroup (10 mins) V. Any Other Business (10 mins) VI. Homework</p>
--	--	--

Erica - Called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm

Agenda

I. Review, approve minutes from 11/6/2019

- Motioned by *Yev* seconded by *Jeffrey*. Approved by majority, with one abstention

II. Announcements/admin updates

- Erica: Congrats to Yev for being appointed to the National Science Foundation review panel for the Graduate Research Fellowship Program.

- Yev: Usually this scholarship is awarded to students from ivy league schools. NSF is looking to expand their horizons and push towards equity within the STEM community.
- Kristin: Everyone is invited to the Swedish American Museum in Andersonville Tuesday 11/19/2019 at 6:30 pm as she engages in a TED talk style discussion about children's human rights. Dinner will be served first. \$10/person. \$5/student.
- Erica: Meeting with Vice President Duarte 11/18/2019 at 1 pm. Maybe Jeff will join the meeting, if he's available. Assessment Times are close to being finalized but they won't be done in enough time for the meeting with Vice President Duarte. However, when they all are finalized, Erica will email everything to Vice President Duarte. Erica is on the agenda for the retention focused meeting to speak during the Q & A portion of the meeting.
-

III. Assessment Times update

- Erica: Yev has agreed to enter the 50 page Assessment Times document into publisher, so everyone must be done by Sunday midnight.
- Mike: wants more feedback for his assessment times piece.
- Erica: would like additional feedback on her article since it goes on the first page. She likes Jeff's article but wants to be sure to highlight our work's differences from frivolous art.
- Domenico: Wonders if there is a length limit because his piece will be much longer by Sunday.
- Erica: No limit, but liaisons should have a minimum of one page.

IV. GenEd Subgroup

- Process: Dave, Camelia, Paul, Jack, Erica, Carrie
- Model: Domenico, Gustav, Jack, Erica, Carrie
- Erica: Confirming members and adding others that may want to join. Erica wants to confirm that the subgroups are ready to take steps on the capabilities model. Is this correct? Erica also confirmed that members can work on both subgroups.
- Loretta wants to be added to the model revision subgroup. Yev would like to be added to both.
- Erica: If the subgroups are able to work effectively electronically, then the committee will continue on this path (subgroups working electronically), but if the subgroups aren't gaining traction electronically, then it will be brought to the full committee during the weekly meetings. Erica did not build time for subgroup meetings into the weekly meetings, but is willing to consider it for subgroups to meet during the weekly assessment meeting. At this point, the default inquiry topic is: what factors lead students to wait to take math courses until the end of their time at HWC.
- Yev: A conversation she had with Dean Wiggan, Meghan Chandler, and Jashed Fakhrid-Deen about separating online learning and hybrid learning. According to Yev, Vincent want to look at student attitudes about online learning. Yev was wondering if a new survey is needed to find out or if the previous survey (the online learning assessment given by Jen Asimow in Fall 2016) can be used to get the information about student attitudes. Information from previous survey might be outdated because many students are taking classes with different delivery modes.
- Camelia: What does it mean to be an online student, hybrid, and/ or face-to-face student is the question at hand?
- Michael: Possible inquiry question- how does mode impact success? We can ask of the research people (Sandy Vuh) about the shift since 2016 in mode and in pass rates, if that's what Vincent is looking for.
- Kristin: Modes are contextual, not hard and fast. She alluded to a past "Harold Lounge" article she wrote about the "summer school method" of focusing on improvement as an

indicator of student learning. She is interested in investigating the length of the term (16 vs 12 vs 8-week) and its correlation with student learning.

- Erica: Reasons may be different and a survey like Jen did may not display the work we are looking for. The best approach may involve surveying students immediately after they enroll if this is possible.
- Dave: Maybe we need intelligent agents in Brightspace to set up a question during registration to kick them to our questions, that leads to the information we need about student expectations. Give them about 4 or 5 questions to answer about the topic.
- Jennifer: There is already a questionnaire in the works about advising that students will have the complete, and we don't want to lengthen it. At this time, the student registration process for both new and returning students is already an extensive process (involving explaining changes to payment, SAP, drop, list of other things).
- Domenico and Yev: engaged in dialogue about what drives the online students to registration; whether it's the availability of staff or student demand.

V. Homework

- Resolve any edits/suggestions to Assessment Times articles by Sunday.
- Subgroups: Start adding to the conversation so that it can be decided if the subgroups is the best approach. Think about the questions you have about student learning. Yev, Loretta and Camelia asked to be added to subgroups.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm

Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning), Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst), Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 11/20/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Mike Heathfield- Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Terrance Hopson-Administration</i> <i>Yev Lapik- Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack- Humanities</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phil Vargas- Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Jennifer Vogel- Advising</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p><u>Honored Guest</u></p> <p><i>Ukaisha Al-Amin</i></p>		<p>Agenda I. Review, approve minutes from 11/13 II. Announcements/admin updates (10 mins) III. Assessment Times update (15 mins) IV. GenEd Update (10 mins) V. Any other business (5 mins) VI. A moment of gratitude (10 mins) VII. Homework--see you again 12/4</p>
--	--	--

Erica - Called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm

Agenda

I. Review, approve minutes from 11/13/2019

- Motioned by *Domenico* seconded by *Mike* . Approved by majority.

II. Announcements/admin updates

- Jeff: Since Erica was out sick for the most recent scheduled meeting, Jeff met with Vice-President and Vincent with the purpose to give an overview of the Assessment Times from the Unit Liaisons.

- Erica: Erica is scheduled to have a meeting with Kent and Vincent on 11/21/2019 to discuss release time. There seem to be more questions from the administration about release time and stipends. The decision to cut particular roles should be discussed by the Assessment Committee and the committee should be kept in the loop.
- Yev: Enrollment is down 30 % from credit production and head count. The suggestion is for faculty to push enrollment with students both before and after Thanksgiving
- Michael: Policy changes determined purely by budget have a history of being quite damaging to students since they don't weigh financial need against student learning. Think about the huge damage done to international students as well as the more recent changes to the payment drop deadline.
- Kristin: each college cut 1.7 million, impacting student learning. Yet District office is still hiring and hasn't implemented cuts there.
- Michael: In three years Harold Washington will have to get reaccredited, therefore we must be prepared to tell the story of our progress. If the decision is made to severely cut release time for the committee based on purely budgetary rather than academic considerations, that's going to be a difficult story to tell. Whatever is driving decisions will have to be explained. Michael suggested that Erica mention this in her meeting.
- Bridgette: In addition to the next HLC visit, the Business program will go through re-accreditation in 2022 and will require assessment support.

III. Assessment Times update

- Erica: Yev is publishing the Assessment Times at this point is is 38 pages long showing a nice range of depth and demonstrates the impact our work has and the various ways we close the loop. This report will be shared in tomorrow's meeting with administration.
- Gustav suggested to Yev an easier process to publish the Assessment Times. They will continue this conversation later.
- Yev: The draft should be ready soon, everyone can make final suggestions by Sunday so that the document can be approved. Kristin motioned to approve the Assessment Times electronically after the Sunday deadline, second by Mike approved by majority with one abstention.*The subsequent electronic vote was motioned by Kristin, seconded by Amy Rosenquist, and the motion carried.*
- Gustav: The acronym written as HWCAC is confusing so maybe it should be written as HWC-AC.
- Erica: It's a valid criticism. There has also been suggestion by Kristin to alter the committee name to the HWC Learning Assessment Committee, so this seems to be a larger discussion. Possible committee name change can be discussed at a later date, but for now Erica went through the Assessment Times document and put the full name (Harold Washington College Assessment Committee) in each article that used the acronym.

IV. GenEd Update

- Erica: There is conversation within the google documents for each of the GenEd subgroups (Process and Model) with movement closer for both of these dimensions. If there are suggestions to improve the process, please share. Is the committee interested in the subgroups generating the plan for a pilot themselves, or do we want to bring that discussion back to the full committee? The pilot could run this semester or next semester but it really depends on the question that we choose to ask.
- Paul: Maybe a plan for the last meeting of the semester on 12/4 is a working meeting for the larger group about General Education model. Is it possible to implement a dry run this semester?
- Gustav: with the process he uses at the end of the semester for student debriefing, he could easily add a question if we wanted to pilot something now.

- Michael and Dave engaged in dialogue about open-ended questions for the process. Michael cautioned against the questions being too open, warning that they could shift away from the committee's remit to focus on student learning. Dave believes that any information students give can possibly impact student learning to some degree and there is a possibility that the information can be used to make changes, but at this point we don't know and it's worth exploring. The committee would be sifting through the responses, doing some interpretive work to find connections to student learning and to drive future assessment inquiries. We wouldn't yet be asking questions about student learning; we'd be asking about student experience to get at information about student learning
- Camelia described it as a pre-assessment process.
- Erica also commented that we are aware of some of the unknowns, but there are also unknown unknowns that may affect student learning and which this more open-ended process could help us explore. That's the point of piloting this new process.
- Domenico: suggested a larger audience to get more information and questioned if this process would be like a satisfaction survey?
- Kristin: Not a satisfaction survey. And even though we'd be getting varied responses to the open-ended question, there are techniques that could help with the analysis: we can do affinity diagramming--there are ways to ask questions more intelligently than others. Some could relate to co-curricular.
- Jack: think about the student population when formulating the questions. The questions should be guided towards the structure of answer we want.
- Gustav: we can guide questions based on the feedback.

V. No other business

VI. Moment of Gratitude

- Erica expressed gratitude for the contributions of the committee members.

VII. Homework

- Remember that there's no meeting next Thursday due to the holiday. Next meeting (and final meeting of the semester) will be Thurs 12/4. Homework before then is to complete your Assessment Times edits before Sunday and to review the discussions in the subgroup documents so we can pick up for that final GenEd discussion on the 4th.

Meeting ended at 4:00pm

Assessment Committee

Harold Washington College



Executive Officers

Erica McCormack(Chair)

Carrie Nepstad (Vice Chair of Gen Ed), Jeffrey Swigart (Vice Chair of Unit Assessment),
Yev Lapik (Online Learning), Michael Heathfield (Co-curricular Assessment),
Fernando Miranda-Mendoza (Research Analyst), Gustav Wiberg (Research Analyst),
Shawntay King (Secretary)

Minutes for 12/04/2019

3:00 PM to 4:00 PM in Room 1046

<p>Members Attending: <i>Kristin Bivens- English</i> <i>Domenico Ferri - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Todd Heldt - Library</i> <i>Terrance Hopson-Administration</i> <i>Yev Lapik- Biology</i> <i>Shawntay King-Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>Bridgette Mahan - Business</i> <i>Erica McCormack- Humanities</i> <i>Fernando Miranda-Mendoza - Math</i> <i>Carrie Nepstad - Social & Applied Sciences</i> <i>David Richardson- Humanities & Music</i> <i>Jeffrey Swigart - Math</i> <i>Phil Vargas- Physical Science</i> <i>Loretta Visomirskis – English</i> <i>Gustav Wiberg - Physical Science</i> <i>Matthew Williams- World Languages/ELL</i></p> <p><u>Honored Guest</u></p> <p><i>Ukaisha Al-Amin--English</i></p>		<p>Agenda</p> <p>I. Review, approve minutes from 11/20</p> <p>II. Announcements/admin updates (10 mins)</p> <p>III. Carrie report on what she learned at the Assessment Institute; preview of her upcoming sabbatical project (15 mins)</p> <p>IV. GenEd Discussion (30 mins)</p> <p>V. Thank you! We'll pick back up on Wednesday of Week 2 of the Spring 2020 semester!</p>
---	--	---

Erica - Called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm

Agenda

I. Review, approve minutes from 11/20/2019

- Motioned by *Jack* seconded by *Phil* . Approved by majority with two abstentions.

II. Announcements/admin updates

- Erica: Erica's meeting with Kent and Vincent to discuss release time has been pushed to next week. .

III. Carrie Report

- Assessment Institute: Carrie attended the pre-conference workshop on Increasing Equity Using Culturally-Relevant Assessment: addressed achievement gaps, how to use the way

we set up assessments to set up more equitable learning experience for all students. Research suggests that transparency is key.. TILT (Transparency in Learning and Teaching) is the framework. Research shows that just changing how we describe an assignment can make a huge impact. Some useful links: <https://tilthighered.com/abouttilt> and <https://tilthighered.com/tiltexamplesandresources>

- Carrie's Sabbatical Project: Carrie will be on sabbatical Spring 2020 semester. Her project is assessment-related. She plans to develop 3 modules and weaving an equity lens into them. One will be Assessment 101; one on Assessment in Practice (units, cycle of assessment); one on co-curricular (assessment outside classroom). This could be a template for things down the road. The committee will share its calendar with Carrie to compare with her sabbatical calendar. These modules could even be developed as coursework for Online Learning (which is changing)

IV. GenEd Discussion

- Erica had asked people to work in subcommittees electronically to finalize discussion of the new GenEd model and new GenEd process. The committee clarified questions about the verbs included in the new model and agreed that the verbs all seem applicable across the GenEd curriculum. The committee discussed different questions we might want to seek responses to using the new process. We are also interested in learning more about student expectations around their learning. Do students, faculty, etc. know what the purpose of an assignment is?
- We will set a goal of piloting the new process by midterm of Spring 2020. The specific question will be worked out in Spring 2020 meetings, but the new process was approved following a motion by Jeff, seconded by Loretta, carried by majority. The new model was approved, following a motion by Kristin, seconded by Carrie, carried by majority.

V. Thank you.

- See you in the Spring 2020!.

Meeting ended at 4:00pm

These minutes were approved by Loretta and seconded by Paul on Jan. 29, 2020