Assessment Committee Minutes 12/12/2011

Members Present: Jim Poole, Femar Lee, Steven Shigemoto, Nadine Leong-Kurio, Jerry Saviano, Eric Paul Shaffer, Renette Sonomura, Cynthia Smith, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Patrick Patterson (Guests Erika Lacro, Ralph Kam)

I. Old Business

A. Continue Review of Assessment Survey Results

i. Institutional Effectiveness Plan – Cynthia (done)

ii. Current State of Public Information on Assessment – Pat (done)

iii. Program Reviews, including timeline and responsible parties – Marcia (done)

- Cynthia will look at various campuses

- Erika filled the committee in on the status of Program Reviews. According to her report, the calculation method for IPRC is adjustable. Data comes from BANNER, and the intercampus group chooses how to define data categories each year. This does leave questions as to how well year-to-year data can be made longitudinally comparable. This is a critical question because it affects program health indicators and how and when programs are declared healthy or unhealthy.

- Cynthia suggested the Assessment Committee sponsor some sessions in Spring 2012 to talk about this with relevant parties.

- The committee agreed that there is a need to be sure that faculty write the program reviews so that there is a cycle that goes to the campus and through the budgeting process, and so that faculty are aware of the status of their programs.

- The committee agreed that program reviews need to be posted so the campus can see and review them. Assessment Committee needs to be involved in the process also, and we need to figure out what our role is, so that we can assess the use of the program reviews and their distribution.

- Cynthia suggested the need for training for the Assessment Committee so that we understand what we are looking at.

- Since program review data is most valuable on campus as a part of our own review process, we can assume that the Assessment Committee does not need to be bound by the system deadlines in reviewing the Program Reviews.

- Erika said that after Assessment Committee review, we need town hall meetings, and that the Assessment Committee should be involved in the town meetings and reviews publicly.
- The upshot of all of this is that HCC is in the Assessment development stage when it comes to Program Reviews. Town Hall meetings will also show Program Review writers with less experience how strong reviews are written, so disseminating not only data, but helping the campus to improve its skills as well.

- Jim noted that budget information is missing from the Annual Report, as is SLO Assessment. The SLO Assessment piece will be there next year, including a paragraph that has comments from advisory boards for the different programs. Erika noted that the budget information is included in the 5-year comprehensive report.

- Erika said that the new Academic Support Dean should be on the IPRC, and report on the IPRC to the Assessment Committee and the campus.

- Erika and Steven noted that at the moment, Program Review data is very superficial, and they would like to see more depth and specifics. It would be nice to have a think tank of IR people in the system to continue to improve Program Review.

**Cynthia suggested that the Assessment Committee redefine itself, and rewrite the committee charter to create a better membership structure, longer member terms of service, rolling staggered terms of service. Cynthia noted that she would be willing to work on the charter.**

*Nadine suggested the new membership include a Student Services Representative*

* The committee agreed to propose membership to Russel Uyeno as the administrative member, and to keep Russel and Erika in the loop on committee actions.

- Jim noted that the specific calculations that lead to healthy and unhealthy Program Review designations are not included within program reviews themselves. As a matter of transparency, perhaps they should be.

iv. Transfer Student Follow-up, "Leaver" research, Career Student follow-up – Cynthia and Steve (done)

v. General Education Outcomes Research – Marcia (done)

- Marcia suggested we survey faculty using a series of focused surveys to each campus group to find out how they are using assessment to transform their teaching. The Assessment Committee would need to encourage participation in this. Another good source of data on this would be the recertification forms for core designations, particularly the Diversifications forms. Pat agreed to talk to Jennifer Higa about doing this.

The committee finished the meeting by setting a new regular meeting time for Spring, 2012 Semester. That time will be the fourth Friday of each month at 11:00 AM.