CCIE Minutes

Jan. 29, 2016

Present: Charles, Marcia, Steven (chair), Red, Mike, Pat

The chair called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM

Old Business

1. The committee unanimously adopted the notes of the previous meeting
2. The committee unanimously voted to accept the midyear report of the Assessment Task Force
3. The committee unanimously voted to accept the midyear report of the Accreditation Task Force
4. The committee discussed Institutional Effectiveness
   a. Marcia noted that the Chancellor has promised to task the deans with evaluating the Institutional Learning Outcomes. Beyond that, no new information has been forthcoming as of 1/29. Marcia will check on what progress has been made. The task given to the deans was to make sure that their respective Program Outcomes aligned with the ILOs.
   b. Marcia and Jeff will resend templates for Program Outcomes to the programs.
   c. Pat mentioned that sharepoint now has the capacity to link SLO to PLO to ILO for all courses/programs using the database in the Honolulu CC Assessment site.
   d. The committee further discussed the meaning of Institutional effectiveness
      i. Suggestions that it has to do with effective use of resources, and whether the institution has clear priorities.
      ii. The committee decided that our conception should come first, then a comparison with other institutions, in order to make certain that we define the concept in a way indigenous to HCC.
      iii. The Institutional Effectiveness handbook can be edited by all members. It still has no definition of Institutional Effectiveness. That is one place to be sure our definition goes once we have settled upon it.
      iv. The committee agreed that IE should be defined carefully in order to provide a reasoned basis for what we should be doing. Such a definition will help us to redefine our IE plan. That should lead to strategic planning that allows us to react to what students need (i.e. problems with traditional majors in some CTE programs, etc...)
      v. It was also suggested that as an institution we might consider redefining success.
      vi. Marcia agreed to write a definition for the committee to work with.
   e. The discussion then moved on to the idea that the IE Handbook needs to be a "living document" that provides both opportunities for review and revision, and can contain the broad range of activities carried out by the College.
5. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Patrick M. Patterson
1. Mission:
   a. What to look for:
      i. Has committee been meeting charter mission over past 2-3 years?
         1. The committee has been functional for three semesters, 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.
               ii. The Task Force was able to meet with two of the
                   four programs which completed their 5-year
                   Review of Program Data last academic year. From
                   those meetings, the following conclusions were
                   possible:
                    1. All programs would like some feedback
                       after the ARPD is finished so that they can
                       both close the loop, and understand the
                       purpose of the exercise.
                    2. All programs have issues with the way in
                       which data is calculated in the health calls.
                       a. In many programs, the use of
                          graduation rates is not the best or
                          only method for measuring student
                          success.
                       b. The calculation of numbers of majors
                          may be out of sync with the ability of
                          the program to accommodate
                          majors.
                       c. Student registration calculations may
                          not square with actual student
                          populations within programs.
3. There is some question as to whether the 5-year review takes the place or, or needs to be done in parallel with, the annual review for the year in which it is due.

4. There is some controversy over whether the annual review or the five-year review is the most helpful for programs.

5. It is not clear how the five-year review or the annual reviews have any effect upon budget decisions.

6. Programs would like to have assistance in writing their reviews in the form of a glossary of terms and a rubric for effective writing (which the Task Force is currently working on).

   iii. The Task Force was not able to meet with programs whose five-year reviews are due this Academic Year, despite multiple attempts. It is therefore at this point unclear how the Task Force will be able to assist those programs with their documents.

C. Help ensure that assessment activities are appropriately documented and communicated to the campus at large.

   i. Because of improvements by Microsoft, Inc. to the Sharepoint online system, the HCC Sharepoint Assessment Site now has working document libraries and databases that are in the testing stage. These appear to have the capability to meet the needs for document and data storage for campus assessment activities. The Task Force is currently in the process of making decisions as to what specific information/reports are necessary in order to set up working document libraries, databases, and reporting systems for the campus which could potentially become active Spring Semester.

   ii. The Task Force has decided to ask for the participation in Spring of a few willing programs in order to test the Sharepoint system.

   iii. The University System and CC System are currently considering whether to mandate a unified Assessment Record Keeping software product. Current representative on the system-wide committee charged with this discussion is Keala Chock.
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.

iii. Are there obstacles to committee fulfilling its mission? Explain what these are and propose solutions.
   a. Currently the HCC Campus appears to be suffering from Assessment Fatigue. Participation in Assessment Task-Force-related activities is declining precipitously.
   b. The committee has difficulty making decisions regarding the record-storage system and Assessment activity assistance to the campus in large part because the Task Force suffers from a lack of visibility, and campus attitudes toward assessment lack a sense of importance or urgency. These are issues that the Task Force has attempted, and will continue to attempt to address.

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 has met three times (September, October, November). Having the Task Force on the General Meeting Calendar has, as was hoped last year, improved meeting regularity and attendance by members of the committee.

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)

- Assessment Specialist/Coordinator Chair: Patrick Patterson
- Accreditation Liaison Officer: Marcia Roberts-Deutsch
- Representative from UC: Bed Paudyal
- Representative from Tech 1/Tech 2: Jeff Schultz
- Representative from Student Services: Erica Balbag-Gerard - volunteer list
- Representative from Academic Support: Wayne Sunahara
- Representative from Administrative Services:
- Representative from Administration: Keala Chock
- Representative from PPIR: Steven Shigemoto
- Representative of ASUH-HCC:
- Representative from Accrediation Task Force:

ii. Do all members need to be permanent standing members or could voices be included on consulting basis?
   1. 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.

iii. 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, December 3, 2015.
Membership: Steven Auerbach, Diane Caulfield, Ross Egloria, Shanon Miho, Pat Patterson, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Steven Shigemoto, Cynthia Smith, Monique Tingkang.

Meetings: September 18, October 16, and November 13, 2015.

Activities in Fall Semester:
- Reviewed follow-up to Annual Report (submitted in March 2015) in response to request for more information from ACCJC. This will allow us to provide a better report in March 2016.
- Final review of Midterm Report and AIP, submitted to BOR and ACCJC in October 2015.
- Developed a Work Plan for 2015-2016, identifying some specific tasks to focus on. These included the following:
  - orientation to new standards from ACCJC (Town Hall?)
  - final check of AIP
  - preparation for 2016 Annual Report
  - preparation for response from ACCJC to Midterm Report
  - Pre-planning for new self-study
- Reviewed Accreditation Survey data, and identified several key themes and items to follow up on, including the following:
  - Communication
  - Crisis Management Team
  - Program Review
  - Reorganization
  - Assessment
  - Hiring Process
  - Budget Process
- Began more focused discussion of the Communication issue, with tie-in to CLT recommendations and Chancellor’s Talk Story / Coffee Hour sessions.
- Reviewed the issue of Assessment of Administration; will need to follow up on this.
- Received additional orientation to the use of Sharepoint from Pat Patterson, Chair of the Assessment Task Force.

Submitted by
Marcia Roberts-Deutsch
Dean, University College, and
Accreditation Liaison Officer