I. The Assessment Committee meeting convened at 2:35 PM in Building 6, room 101

Members Present: Jon Blumhart, Jim Poole, Femar Lee, Steven Shigemoto, Nadine Leong-Kurio, Jerry Saviano, Eric Paul Shaffer, Renette Sonomura, Cynthia Smith, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Patrick Patterson

II. Old Business:

A. The committee began to review the status reports provided by members.

i. Pat noted that the key problem with public information on Assessment is that the distribution is spotty - this is primarily because there is no single location where all this information is gathered. Marcia suggested that Pat talk with Billie Takaki-Lueder regarding this problem. That item will be number one on Pat’s agenda before the next meeting.

- Jerry wondered what happened to the HCC Assessment Specialist position, and agreed to pursue this question in FSEC and CLT to find out whether that position has been lost.

ii. Marcia noted that the big question with regard to Program Reviews is “where are they?” This is not a rhetorical question - their location on the Internet is very hard to find, which makes access very difficult.

- Jim noted that assessment of program SLO’s is missing, and are likely to remain missing until later this Spring Semester. It is difficult to get the programs to finish their Reviews on time.

- Jerry brought up the question of methodology in calculating the number of majors in a program. After discussion with input from Steven, Jim, and several other members of the committee, it became clear that there is still some question as to the effectiveness of the methodology, what group made the decision on the methodology, and whether that methodology is binding across the UHCC System.
- Summarizing the committee’s discussion, it became clear that the Program Reviews must be made more accessible, and we must clarify the methodology for compiling the data used for them. This is critical, as Program Reviews are a key to programs being able to acquire resources.

- Cynthia suggested that the Assessment Committee consider helping with training in Program Reviews by hosting workshops this Spring Semester.

iii. Steven and Cynthia Reported on Transfer Student Follow-up, “Leaver” research, Career Student follow-up: the overall gist is that the surveys we use for tracking have a very low (15%) response rate, which leaves major questions about the usefulness of the data. It is also unclear what that data is used for. The committee agreed that it is necessary to clarify the use of the data, and then redirect survey methods, and questions, to fit that need. After which, the Assessment Committee should be sure that all data is being shared with the appropriate end-users for the purpose of helping to improve program outcomes.

ix Feed School Surveys - Jerry reported that next to no outreach to feeder schools is currently being conducted. The committee agreed that outreach needs to be happening, but we were unable to agree as to what our function should be in relation to that research - the question arises as to what we are assessing - whether that is the satisfaction of potential college students with HCC outreach programs, or the outreach programs themselves. The committee also agreed that a baseline data set is the first step - we should find out exactly what schools are sending students to what programs and in what numbers. This would be a useful starting point for assessment of outreach.

viii Client/User Evaluations - Nadine reported that almost all Client/User organizations on campus are conducting some sort of assessment. The data from those assessments, and how it is being used, however, is not easily available to the public at this time. Pat noted that all of the survey systems seem to be localized to a single group, making it difficult to compare effectiveness of organizations. Nadine wants the Assessment Committee to check on the state of development of the recommended “Service Learning Objectives” for this group.

Conclusions: The meeting ended with a brief summary: Assessment is happening on campus, but is not well-distributed or publicized. The Assessment Committee needs to find ways to better publicize assessment information that is being collected. Pat will work on this. The committee needs to understand who the users of each assessment data system are, and how they are using assessment to improve, then facilitate that by channelling information to end-users more efficiently. The committee needs to ensure that assessment is not only being done, but that it is being discussed by the relevant groups and used to improve programs and organizations on campus.
III. The committee concluded its business at 3:30 PM, with more to do in reviewing the reports. The committee is reserving action steps until we have a chance to review all reports submitted, and compare the results with the Planning Agenda items concerning assessment from the last accreditation report.