Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

February 24, 2011
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Alakai 118

Dave Krupp, Natural Sciences
Sarah Hadmack, Humanities
Paul Briggs, Social Sciences (from 2:45 p.m.)
Mariko Kershaw, Academic Support
Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Language Arts
Ardis Eschenberg, Division I Dean

Non-voting members present:
Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, Convener and Notetaker; Doug Dykstra, Chancellor, Kathleen French, CCAAC Chair

Voting Members excused: Young-A Choi, Business and Math; Leslie Lyum, Writing Lab; Mary Segura, Writing Lab; Inge White, Natural Sciences, Leslie Opulauoho, Student Services; Nalani Kaun, Institutional Research Office

Jan convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Jan started by saying that she had not copied the Philosophies of Assessment from other schools yet. Ardis volunteered to have them copied.

Jan then described the two workshops that will occur on March 4. The first on Linking SLOs to Budget and Planning will use the new Course-Level Assessment Form, which now has all the Certificate SLOs, and the Planning and Budget Council Form, which will be modified to look like it might look next year. Workshop attendees will be filling in the Planning and Budget Council Summary Sheet Rationale and Justification sections based on a course level assessment. The idea was to make this a real task. Faculty/staff could bring their own assessment forms and tie that assessment to a budget need for faculty, equipment, or supplies. Ellen suggested that Jeff, Jan, and Richard use the new assessment form and give faculty/staff the assessment to work from or send a message to the faculty/staff listserv to bring their own materials. Kathleen mentioned that the comments she had received about the Course Assessment Form was that it was difficult because it was on legal-sized paper rather than letter-sized paper. Ardis stressed that the intent was to have it as a web-based form so that this should not be a problem. Dave asked who would be tracking the data. Doug mentioned that we are looking at web-based software for a repository for our assessments, such as Trac-Dat and TraskStream. Until the software is purchased, it will be the Office of Planning and Program Evaluation’s responsibility to track assessment data.
Jan reported that the second workshop on Interpreting Data would focus on the departmental report data presented to the department chairs. The new data is not available yet, so the data from last year will be used. Ardis asked whether or not this meant that the Departmental Report Template was being modified. Jan stated that it was hoped that a 3-page Executive Summary would be added with a cover sheet indicating program health. Doug said that a 3-page three executive summary was probably on the short-side, but he felt that a 10-page summary would be applicable.

Jan asked Ellen if she was available at 3 p.m. on March 3 as she, Richard, and Jeff were meeting to finalize the packet for Excellence in Ed day. Doug said that was the time for the Open Forum with President Greenwood. As this is the only time that is available during the week because of CCSSE, ACCJC, and PPE, Jeff, Richard, Ellen, and Jan will still meet. Hopefully, they will be able to attend some of the Forum.

Jan then asked Ardis to have the Gen Ed Competencies that she had worked on earlier in the year copied, which Ardis did. Paul passed out the Philosophies of Assessment from various schools as well as Windward’s and the Gen Ed Competencies to all present.

Discussion ensued on whether the Gen Ed Competencies were outcomes or competencies. Ellen stressed that outcomes were more general and competencies were more specific. The committee decided that rather that the list should be called Gen Ed Themes. Paul then asked clarification on the difference between themes, outcomes, and competencies. Themes are the board general terms, outcomes are the more general outputs students are expected to perform, and competencies are the specific tasks that students need to perform.

Dave asked were Ability to Solve Quantitative Problems was in the Gen Ed Themes list. Ardis said that was part of the AA Degree Outcomes more than the Gen Ed Themes and that we decided to revisit both during Convocation. Discussion then ensued regarding Convocation. Should it be one day or two? Should we use the Gen Ed Themes list to start the discussion? Doug and Ardis stressed that we were on a short-leash as far as running a cycle of assessment showing that we were assessing both Gen Ed and Program SLOs when doing course-level assessment. She volunteered to send a link to Jan re what they did at her previous institution, and Jan would forward this to the rest of the group ASAP. Maybe this would be the basis of the Convocation Activity in the Fall.

Jan will send the soft copies of the Philosophies of Assessment and the Gen Ed Themes to all committee members ASAP.

The committee discussed the Timeline of Assessment Activities. Jan said that she was trying to have a written document that showed the policies and procedures related to assessment so that those coming after we leave will have something tangible to follow. Kathleen mentioned that this was not actually a time line. Ellen said that originally, the document was a summary of assessment activities to give the committee direction. Ardis recommended switching the x and y axis. Jan will try to do this ASAP and rename the
document. Dates and in depth discussion on who is responsible for what, what is included in the report, and the process involved will be discussed at the next meeting.

Jan will send out a Doodle link before Monday on the date and time of the next meeting – some time between March 7 and March 16.

The meeting was convened at 3:50 p.m.