November 9, 2011 (W). 2:00 pm
Self Study Standard 1 Meeting with Marcia

The mission process does not have to be informal in the way that Jerry disseminated the mission statement to the whole campus.

The assumption by ACCJC is that the process of decision making and planning will involve as many parties and constituencies as possible. The PC and FSEC are the final arbiters of this.

Revision of the mission statement should be done in a particular time frame so we have closure with this.

Perhaps we need to monitor the mission statement on a regular (perhaps annual) basis. Do we need to revisit the mission, and are there emerging issues that we need to address anew?

For 1B, there are process-oriented issues.
How do you implement your mission?
How do you structure and assess that statement?
This has a lot to do with the planning process and with infrastructure of planning and implementation and the dialogue piece is very important.

We really don't have an institutional assessment, but we do actually do this in pieces. We assess some of the planning cycle, but we don't connect these as institutional outcomes. We aren't in a position to be faulted for that but we can connect how a program links to the larger institutional mandate.

In terms of evidence, we are mostly relying on the minutes posted on the Intranet. One of the issues is that discussion isn't reflected well in the minutes. If they want to make it look like we had some input into the process the minutes should really reflect this better. The FSEC sometimes does resolutions but it's important to reflect how the body feels, rather than just noting what was decided upon. In other words, it would be nice to have proceedings documented, rather than just minutes according to Roberts Rules.

Tracking the GenEd process is also something we are looking to do.

The PC should be a neutral entity, so the official record of the Planning Council is important.

There is no record of evidence from Kupu ka wai, but it is within our purview to interview them. We can also interview the Chancellor on what his understanding is of the nature of their participation. Talking to Erika would also be a good idea. So far we do not have evidence that Kupu ka wai has this role, so we need evidence that they are in fact a leadership group in shared governance on campus.
Pat Patterson is now Convener of the Assessment Committee. The committee is in the process of putting together a status report of different parts of the Assessment Committee.

Not all faculty have to do evaluations. There are common hallmarks for certain areas. Faculty need to clarify how they do assessment. They also need to know that they are responsible for the process of assessment, not the outcome of the assessment.

How are we mapping course SLOs to program SLOs? Programs that have external certifications like AUTO and AERO have a mechanism. CTE assessments vary by program. For example, the union is the only one that keeps records for Sheet Metal. We should be moving toward a more systematic approach.

One of our real strengths is the planning, between budgeting and outcomes. We can see changes.

The broad-based dialogue piece is important in 1B. We do communicate openly both internally and externally and make an effort to make information available.

We tried the rack cards. Response from the campus has been mixed. We are learning from experience, and we are doing much better in the past. Previous chancellors or provosts didn't value PR. Visibility of the campus is important, not just in PR but also accountability. Clarification of Billie's and Karen's roles may be useful.

PR should be framed in terms of student success, community engagement, and students benefiting from the experiences. Non-monetary resource minutes on TV are big. This can go in 1B5.

How are the CCs participating in Race to the Top and P20? AtD would probably be the best data to follow here. There would also be some overlap with Standard 2A.

Take a look at the SECE report student engagement to see how students perceive the value of the quality of their education. There are key findings that we can pull out of that report. Erika can be a resource there. Looking at longitudinal comparisons may also help to see emerging trends.

We can mention aligning our courses with Manoa's courses in the context of working as a component of a system. This would potentially have an impact on our courses and how our students are doing.

We should probably be talking to Pat about these issues, since we are presently operating without an assessment coordinator. There are questions we need answered such as, "What is the status of MIR? Is it still called MIR?"

There is some overlap in our standard and the governance standard.
How are priorities based on justified need? This is integrated in the decision making, especially when we need to reallocate resources internally. As a result, this also acts as greater endorsement of the process itself.

Just showing that we have an assessment framework back in place is big.

Writing this itself is a form of assessment.
It has taken a while to get comfortable with assessment as a campus.

Fumi will resend the link to the guide to everyone.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm
Minutes respectfully submitted by Fumi Takasugi