1. Mission:
   a. What to look for:
      i. Has committee been meeting charter mission over past 2-3 years?
         1. The committee has only been functional for one year, so the answer to this question is a matter of ongoing need for scrutiny.
         2. The committee has a threefold mission.
            a. Function as a standing sub-committee of the Committee on Institutional effectiveness.
               i. In this capacity the committee has been functioning as warranted in the charter. The committee regularly reports its actions and deliberations to the CCIE, and to the campus as a whole through committee minutes posted on the campus intranet site.
            b. Have primary responsibility in planning, advising and monitoring the progress of assessment-related activities of the College
               i. In this capacity, the committee has been partially successful. The committee is aware of this aspect of its mission. However, in its first year, the committee did little advising and/or monitoring the progress of assessment-related activities. The committee did work on planning to some degree, beginning the process of adopting a set of guidelines for programs to use in creating five-year reviews, and participating in the creation of a position on campus dedicated to assessment activities by consulting in the beginnings of the hiring process. The responsibility for the lack of headway in the other two parts of this assignment lie with the chair of the committee, for whom the challenges of the third charge, organizational challenges, and limited time caused a failure to adequately perform the duties required by the committee.
            c. Help ensure that assessment activities are appropriately documented and communicated to the campus at large.
               i. The committee spent the majority of its time on this effort over the course of the 2014-2015 academic year. The chair, and committee, felt that primary to accomplishing b. above, adequate documentation and storage of assessment data is
required. This necessitated the beginnings of pilot tests of several assessment tools, including a numeric database, LiveText software, and SharePoint software. The testing of these tools led to a recognition of the need to carefully configure the tools and our planned use of them before rolling them out to constituents. That process has been time-consuming, but is ongoing and beginning to meet with some success. The committee will be sponsoring an Assessment Showcase at the beginning of Fall semester in which the assessment practices of several units of the College will be demonstrated, as will the storage, retrieval, and reporting capacity of the assessment tools chosen.

ii. Does it require a standing committee to meet this mission or would ad hoc/occasionally constituted task group suffice?
   1. Given the fact that assessment is a key part of the accreditation puzzle, and that our goal, and the ACCJC requirement is that assessment and accreditation activities be ongoing, rather than periodic, it is necessary that this committee be a standing committee.
   2. Further, the committee should consider meeting more frequently, and diversifying its agenda for each meeting to be sure it is covering all of its responsibilities. The chair of the committee should be tasked with maintaining an ongoing agenda that is interactive, live, and constantly updating.

iii. Are there obstacles to committee fulfilling its mission? Explain what these are and propose solutions.
   1. It is first and foremost necessary to state that the responsibility for the committee’s failure to complete its full mission this academic year lies with the chair of the committee. The chair accepts that responsibility. The following suggestions are intended to assist the committee in creating an organized structure such that it may adequately execute the responsibilities within its purview in future.
      a. The chair of the committee should be either a full-time Assessment Coordinator, or a faculty member with both assigned time and the support of a full-time assessment coordinator.
      b. The roles of committee members should be made clear – in order for the chair to help members understand their purpose on the committee, the committee should define the roles of each member and the reasons for that membership.
2. Meetings:
   a. What to look for:
      i. How often does the committee meet?
      ii. Is this schedule adequate to fulfill intended purpose? Should it meet more or less frequently?
   b. The committee meets monthly. Over the course of this academic year, the committee missed meeting three times (November, March, and May). The cancelled meeting in March was due to a budget ranking process meeting that committee members were encouraged to attend. The failures to meet in November and May were due to poor planning by the committee chair. The chair has proposed that the committee be placed on the general meeting schedule such that meeting dates will be institutionalized, reducing the possibility of overlooked scheduling.

3. Membership:
   a. What to look for:
      i. Does current membership enable committee to effectively meet mission?
         1. Current membership is adequate. The only concern is that a number of members of the committee are not present in every meeting. This is not a chronic problem, in the sense that the missing members are not the same representatives each time. However, a more effective committee might impress upon members better the importance of this committee in the overall picture of Institutional Effectiveness on campus. More effective meetings and a more active campus presence might also have the effect of showing more fully the importance of the committee to the campus and to the accreditation and community outreach processes.
         2. The committee should clarify the reasons for each position in the membership list, thus making evident the need for each member to participate in committee activities.
   3. Current membership list:

Assessment Task Force (AsTF)

4. Assessment Specialist/Coordinator Chair: Patrick Patterson
5. Accreditation Liaison Officer: Marcia Roberts-Deutsch
6. Representative from UC: Bed Paudyal - volunteer list
7. Representative from Tech 1/Tech 2: Jesse Aki - volunteer list
8. Representative from Student Services: Erica Balbag-Gerard - volunteer list
9. Representative from Academic Support:
10. Representative from Administrative Services: Sharon Isa (Selected by Douglas Boettner)
11. Representative from Administration: Keala Chock (Selected by Chancellor)
12. Representative from PPIR:
13. Representative of ASUH-HCC:
14. Representative from Accreditation Task Force: TBA

i. Do all members need to be permanent standing members or could voices be included on consulting basis?
   1. The committee was designed to be “lean and mean” – that is, a pared down committee. The current membership represents the bare minimum of representatives necessary to access, and support, campus assessment activities. As it is, the committee must depend for its authority primarily on the overall perceived importance of assessment on campus, and the authority of its supervising committee, the CCIE. Membership is therefore adequate, and all current members are needed on the committee. Attendance of all members needs to be better.

ii. What (if any) changes in membership are needed?
   1. No changes are necessary.

4. Communication:
   a. What to look for:
      i. Is committee’s intranet presence accurate and updated?
         1. The committee has posted minutes frequently, though not in a timely manner according to reasonable expectations and best practices.
         2. The committee is difficult to find on the Intranet site, and as SharePoint is not yet fully operational, the committee’s public presence is problematic at best.
      ii. Are minutes posted in a timely manner?
         1. Minutes have been posted within 30 days of meetings. They should be posted within 5 days of meetings.
      iii. Are they easily located?
         1. No. Redesign of the Intranet has created a situation in which the committee’s minutes are difficult to find.
      iv. Are all key documents (policies) related to committee posted and accessible?
         1. The committee charter (draft) is posted on the SharePoint site for the committee. As this site is not yet fully operational, that charter is both out of date, and very difficult to find.

Respectfully submitted by Patrick Patterson, Assessment Task Force Chair and acting Assessment Coordinator, May 12, 2015.