March 31, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate, Windward Community College
c/o Presiding Chair Ross Langston

FROM: Doug Dykstra, Chancellor

SUBJECT: Amendment to Department Chairs Duties/Responsibilities and Compensation

I am seeking amendments to the published Duties and Responsibilities of Department Chairs in Credit Instruction as found at the following web-site address:
http://windward.hawaii.edu/office_of_academic_affairs/Department_Chairs

Our college must be prepared to meet the standards for SLO assessment at the “Proficiency Level” described on the attached rubric from ACCIC. An honest appraisal of our progress toward satisfying the bulleted points suggests that we may have satisfied only one or two of them and that we must have clearly satisfied all eight bulleted points by the time of our ACCIC visitation in November 2012. We have much work to do, and I must recruit the help of senior level leadership at the departmental chair level.

To meet this critical challenge I am proposing the following changes to the document on duties and responsibilities:

- Section I.C. Curriculum and Instruction...add a third bulleted item to read, “Coordinate SLO Assessment at the course, program and institutional levels as appropriate on behalf of the department.”
- Section I.F. Department/Division Governance...add a third bulleted item to read, “Represent the department on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.”
- Section III Selection and Compensation of Department Chairs in Credit Instruction...change the first sentence in paragraph 4 to read, “Each Department Chairperson will be released from a minimum of 6 credit hours of classroom instruction each semester.....”

Our college must have senior level leadership of the SLO assessment process at the departmental level. This is a serious offer at a critical moment and the Administration is prepared to support departmental leadership with the additional assigned time, as well as with direct participation in departmental meetings to advise participants in the analysis and application of assessment results if requested. Bear in mind that we face a return to “Warning Status” should we fail to meet the Proficiency level for SLOs because the ACCIC will no longer tolerate delays.

Although all faculty members must participate in student learning outcomes assessment, analysis and discussion of the implications for curriculum, pedagogy, planning and budgeting, the department chair is
crucial to providing the venue for such collegial discussions at scheduled department meetings when assessment data has been reported. Moreover our college will need to show notes/minutes from all of our department meetings that document such discussions if we are to meet the bullet point as follows: There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results (of assessment). Moreover our college faces a critical task of mapping all course level learning outcomes to the program level and institutional/college level learning outcomes and this too will require leadership at the departmental level. Finally, the UH Community College system has punctuated the point that each college must have in place a means to assess SLOs at the program and institutional/college level that invokes some form of third party validation of the quality of student work. This is indispensable and will require both leadership and ingenuity to satisfy the expectation.

Working together, with leadership prepared to set the agenda, establish due dates, answer queries, and provide timely advice we can accomplish the expectations to which we will be held by our accrediting body. However, we must have both the complete commitment from Vice Chancellors and Deans to the foregoing service, as well as Departmental Chair dedication to implementing these developments.

I consider this request to be crucial to the successful reaccreditation of our beautiful, resourceful and talented campus and shall be happy to meet with the Senate if you wish to discuss this proposal.

Attachment
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges  

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes  
(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

| Levels of Implementation | Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes  
(Sample institutional behaviors) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Awareness                | • There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.  
• There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.  
• There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.  
• Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.  
• The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin. |
| Development              | • College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.  
• College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.  
• Existing organizational structures (e.g. Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.  
• Leadership groups (e.g. Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.  
• Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.  
• Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development. |
| Proficiency              | • Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees.  
• Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices.  
• There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.  
• Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.  
• Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.  
• Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.  
• Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.  
• Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled. |
| Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement | • Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.  
• Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.  
• Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.  
• Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.  
• Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews. |