CCIE Meeting Minutes
May 20, 2016, 11:00 a.m. – 12 noon

Present: Pat Patterson, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Kahale Saito, Conred Maddox, Charles Miller
Not present: Katy Ho, Mike Meyer

1. **CCIE Minutes of 4/22/16 approved.**

2. **Assessment Task Force (AsTF) End-of-Year Report**

   Pat noted that the AsTF accomplished a lot over the year, meeting with two programs (AERO and Academic Support) who previously completed comprehensive program reviews, and generally raising awareness of assessment on campus. Programs that were currently working on reviews did not demonstrate interest in receiving additional support from the task force. Red asked if there has been a change in perception regarding assessment, that it is not punitive but meant to help program improvement. Pat opined that there has been with the example of University College using Sharepoint and the SLO inventory database and people asking for help rather than fearing a dictatorial presence.

3. **Accreditation Task Force (AcTF) End-of-Year Report**

   Marcia explained that the format of the report is the same as last year’s. She felt that the AcTF similarly accomplished much over the year between the Town Hall and organizing volunteers for the various standards based on their preferences. The College is in good position and the plan is to recruit new members for the standard committees in early Fall 2016. Marcia mentioned that the Accreditation 2018 site was up on the intranet and Pat added that the Assessment showcase material was also available online.

4. **Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Handbook**

   There was a brief discussion on how continuing work on the IE Handbook might be addressed by next year’s CCIE. Marcia stated that it might be easier to conceptualize if it’s not a “handbook” and described alternatively. Red suggested that they act as guidelines and Pat added that the Handbook may be considered a reference, a view of what the CCIE sees as effective practices.

5. **New Business (Other Topics of Concern)**

   Pat announced that John DeLay will be taking over for him as AsTF Chair in Fall 2016, but he will continue to attend meetings for a period of time. He expressed confidence that Mr. DeLay will perform well in this capacity given his skill set and interest in assessment. Marcia reported that the person hired for the Assessment Coordinator position reconsidered and declined the offer. There is a possibility that the position will be converted to a faculty position from an APT, which may prove more attractive to applicants.

Meeting adjourned.
1. **Mission:**
   a. What to look for:
      i. Has committee been meeting charter mission over past 2-3 years?

The committee has been functional for four semesters. The committee has a threefold mission. The first part is to function as a standing sub-committee of the Committee on Institutional effectiveness. 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.

The second part of the mission is that the AsTF has primary responsibility in planning, advising and monitoring the progress of assessment-related activities of the College

In this capacity, the committee has seen improved success since the previous academic year. 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, we came to the following conclusions:

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. All programs have issues with the way in which data is calculated in the health calls. In many programs, the use of graduation rates (for example) is not the best or only method for measuring student success. The calculation of numbers of majors may be out of sync with the ability of the program to accommodate majors. In another example, student registration calculations may not square with actual student populations within programs.

Other logistical issues arose as well:
- 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.
- There is some controversy over whether the annual review or the five-year review is the most helpful for programs.
- It is not clear how the five-year review or the annual reviews have any effect upon budget decisions.
- 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).
- The Task Force was not able to meet with programs whose five-year reviews are due this Academic Year.
Another key committee function is to help ensure that assessment activities are appropriately documented and communicated to the campus at large. In this mission the committee has achieved significant forward movement over the last three months.

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 early adoption stage. These have the capability to meet the needs for document and data storage and search for campus assessment activities. There are now programs and instructors using SharePoint as the primary location for their assessment-related documents, and an SLO Inventory database, based on the hard-copy document that the College adopted in 2014, is in working order. The University College is currently using SharePoint for these purposes in a two-pronged strategy. Assessment Inventories and Assessment-related documents created before the use of SharePoint (since 2014) are being uploaded to the Assessment Document Library as scanned versions of the paper copies. All SLO inventories being created beginning in Spring, 2016, are being input as data into the SharePoint SLO Inventory database. This new database gives the College the ability to instantly review any of the data points in the SLO Inventory, and to show direct relationships between Student (and Administrative) Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes. The database has now also begun linking each SLO/ALO with Institutional Learning Outcomes.

In addition, the committee has successfully met its mission to publicize campus Assessment data and activities. While not all Assessment data has yet been collected from the various parts of campus, the members of the campus community are more aware of the committee and its mission now than they were even at the beginning of this calendar year. This is due in large part to a successful Assessment Showcase in April, 2016, in which several programs and the PPIR Department shared their current assessment activities and findings with attendees from the campus community. The presentations have been placed on SharePoint and made available to the campus community as a whole in order to continue this part of the committee’s activities.

ii. Does it require a standing committee to meet this mission or would ad hoc/occasionally constituted task group suffice?

iii. 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.

iv. Are there obstacles to committee fulfilling its mission? Explain what these are and propose solutions.

Currently the only obstacles are time and practice. The committee needs to set a goal of making certain that Fall Assessment Kickoff and Spring Assessment Showcase happen regularly each academic year. These help build campus awareness of, and interest in assessment, and make the committee a location of expertise.
It would be helpful if program administrators would take a more active role in encouraging their members to meet with the committee to give feedback and receive help regarding the writing of Program Review documents.

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?
      iii. The committee meets monthly. 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?

Current membership is adequate. The chair of the committee will change beginning in Fall Semester, 2016, as listed below.

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.

Although likely to change somewhat in the Fall Semesters, below is the current membership list:

**Assessment Task Force (AsTF)**

- Assessment Specialist/Coordinator Chair: John Delay (assisted by 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 Accreditation Task Force:
ii. Do all members need to be permanent standing members or could voices be included on consulting basis?

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?

No changes are necessary.

4. Communication:
   a. What to look for:
      i. Is committee’s intranet presence accurate and updated?
      ii.
      The committee has posted minutes regularly. However, since the committee is difficult to find on the College Intranet site, minutes can be most easily accessed using SharePoint.
      iii. Are minutes posted in a timely manner?

Minutes have normally been posted within 30 days of meetings.

iv. Are they easily located?
Yes. SharePoint has made the minutes easy to locate, and search for archived minutes faster and more effective than the previous Intranet site.

v. Are all key documents (policies) related to committee posted and accessible?
Yes. The committee charter (draft) is posted on the SharePoint site for the committee. The Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Handbook is also available and easy to find on the SharePoint Assessment site.

Respectfully submitted by Patrick Patterson, Assessment Task Force Chair and acting Assessment Coordinator, May 20, 2016.
HONOLULU COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ACCREDITATION TASK FORCE

END-OF-YEAR REPORT TO THE
CAMPUS COUNCIL ON INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
May 5, 2016

Membership: Jeffery Arbuckle (Spring 2016), Steven Auerbach, Diane Caulfield, Ross Egloria, Shanon Miho, Pat Patterson, Marcia Roberts-Deutsch, Steven Shigemoto (Fall 2015) Cynthia Smith, Monique Tingkang.

Meetings: September 18, October 16, and November 13, 2015; January 22, February 19, March 18, April 15, 2016.

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:
  a) orientation to new standards from ACCJC (Town Hall?)
  b) final check of AIP
  c) preparation for 2016 Annual Report
  d) preparation for response from ACCJC to Midterm Report
  e) Pre-planning for new self-study
- Reviewed Accreditation Survey data, and identified several key themes and items to follow up on, including the following:
  a) Communication
  b) Crisis Management Team
  c) Program Review
  d) Reorganization
  e) Assessment
  f) Hiring Process
  g) 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.

Activities in Spring Semester:
- Prepared and Reviewed Mid-Year Report to CCIE
- Planned for and presented an Accreditation Town Hall with participation by committee members as well as Erika Lacro, Katy Ho, and Steven Auerbach. Focus on
the new Accreditation Standards and a new requirement: The Quality Focus Essay. Special kudos to Ross Egloria for coordinating the PowerPoint presentation.

- Created a new site on the Intranet for materials related to Accreditation 2018.
- Provided input on the College’s Annual Report to ACCJC.
- Began process of forming Accreditation Self-Study Standards committees with a questionnaire for volunteers. Targeted recruitment will continue in order to fill out and balance the committees.

Submitted by
Marcia Roberts-Deutsch
Dean, University College, and
Accreditation Liaison Officer
May 5, 2016