SLO Ad Hoc Committee report to the Faculty Senate
April 2014

Key activities the last report
• Committee meetings held on 4/11 and 4/16 (minutes available)
• Continued support for assessment activities by faculty and staff through professional development activities and direct support to departments/programs and individuals
• Reviewing Kuali SCM and alternatives given priority for an assessment software solution and implementation timeline

The college's SLO Coaches, Laure and Tony, have continued their professional development workshops. The last workshop of the semester is scheduled on April 25th. An annual report of their activities is included.

The Faculty Forum focused on evaluation and assessment, held on April 9, 2014 prompted the committee to reconsider its recommendation submitted to the Faculty Senate in May 2013. The committee asks the Faculty Senate consider this revised version of our recommendation.

The committee has continued to broaden its knowledge of assessment management systems (AMS). In the last academic year, the committee has created a functionality document that outlines the information an AMS would minimally be required to collect to match the comparable data in the College's CLRs and PLRs. The membership has participated in a planning phase for the Kuali Student Curriculum Management (KSCM) system that will replace Curriculum Central in an effort to incorporate assessment functionality that would meet the needs of the College. In addition members have learned about numerous other AMS options that might be considered instead of KSCM. A variety of information has been gathered through presentations at committee meetings, online and F2F discussions, webinars, and online research. The committee would like the Faculty Senate to consider a recommendation based on this information that encourages the College to move forward with the selection of an AMS and establish a full-time Assessment Coordinator.

Attached are the Assessment Coaches' report, two recommendations to the Faculty Senate and supporting documents. Please note that although this is the committee's April report, the attached files document the work of the committee for the full academic year.
Guidelines for the Use of Learning Outcomes Assessment in Faculty Evaluation

“The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of the effectiveness of producing that learning. Those employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning.” (ACCJC Revisions to Accreditation Standards Approved for First Reading January 2014, Standard III.A.6)

The following questions are guidelines for presenting evidence of involvement with assessment and improvement of student learning as a component in faculty self-evaluation documents such as Contract Renewal, Tenure & Promotion, Lecturer Assessment, and Post-Tenure Review. The questions are adapted from the section addressing Standard III.A.1.c in the ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Institutions, July 2013.

The University of Hawaii Community College Faculty Classification Plan distinguishes three classes of faculty: instructional, counseling and academic support. In responding to the following questions, faculty members should discuss their work from within the framework of their classification.

Where appropriate, faculty members are encouraged to provide quantitative or qualitative assessment data to support their narrative. Aggregated data may be presented where common assessment methods are utilized.

1. What is your role in producing student learning outcomes?

2. What deep thinking have you, as an individual and with your colleagues, engaged in about how well students are learning. What measures have you, again individually and collectively, created or selected to measure that learning?

3. What discussions have you had about how to improve learning? What plans have you made?

4. What changes have you made in your methodologies to improve learning?

5. If you teach, what changes in your course content or sequencing have resulted from analysis of how well students are mastering course content?

6. How have you engaged in professional development toward the development and assessment of student learning outcomes?
Necessity for an Assessment Management System for our College
Recommendation to the Faculty Senate
April 2014

In the last academic year, members of the Ad Hoc Committee on SLO Assessment have sought a substitute to our current procedures for submitting and storing course and program-level assessment data and a solution that will provide ready access to reporting of assessment completion and the impact of analyses of assessment data on improving courses and programs. Based on this work, the committee recommends the following:

1. Kapi‘olani Community College should immediately begin the process of selecting an assessment management system (AMS), preferably a software package designed specifically for this purpose, with configuration and support services provided by the software supplier. The deadline to select, configure, and implement the software should be no later than August 2016. An initial, partial implementation would be preferable in the fall 2015.

2. A full-time Assessment Coordinator should be hired to manage planning and implementation process of the AMS, to upgrade and maintain time sensitive information once the software has been implemented, to design and deliver training to users of the system and to provide individual support where needed. This individual is necessary to deliver a consistent level of support required for the College's chosen AMS solution.

The following narrative provides the background information that supports these recommendations.

Why do we need an assessment management system?

The College has greatly improved its assessment of course-level student learning outcomes (or competencies) and program-level outcomes in the last few years. Our course assessment plans (CAP) documents when courses will be assessed. The course learning reports (CLR) serve to report the results of assessment for each outcome, compare the results to the expected performance, and propose methods for improvement if desired performance levels are not met. Similar documents provide information for programs. At the present time, only the plans for and results of program assessment are synthesized further in the form of ARPDs. For the most part, course plans and reports are collected and archived in departmental or program websites. Some of the College's CTE programs perform more rigorous review of their course level reports and then examine the impact the findings have on their programs. Assessment of Student Services outcomes is progressing in much the same way. Support services are in an early phase of developing an assessment process. During the last academic year, the SLO Assessment Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate has considered how the College may improve this process across the campus through the use of technology.
The term generally given to a software solution for this purpose is assessment management system. "Off-the-shelf" AMS solutions vary in their functionality but most have the following traits.

- Document course and program level learning outcomes and links between them and outcomes for general education and the institution
- Method for submitting assessment data
- Ability to track assessment activities and successes of modifications made in response to assessment results
- Serve as a repository for assessment data and artifacts or other evidence
- Robust and flexible reporting of assessment accomplishments
- Ability to support e-portfolio assessment
- Ability to support instructional, academic support (e.g. counselors, librarians), and student service SLOs
- Template and report writing management for accreditation report writing

An AMS solution has the potential to provide substantial value to managing assessment data and interpreting their significance. It can provide a consistent method/format for submitting assessment data, thus making the process easier for those faculty and staff completing this work. Once submitted, the assessment data is archived and available for comparison with future data. Depending on the assessment methods used, appropriate student work or supporting documentation can be associated with the assessment data submitted. The assessment data serves as a record of the assessment work being done and the impact it has on improving student learning at the College. The ability to run reports on various aspects of the assessment activities helps gauge the completion of assessment and the progress towards meeting course, programmatic and institutional outcomes.

**Wouldn't a system-wide AMS solution make sense?**

The committee generally agrees that all campuses in the UHCC system would be better served by a system-wide employed AMS. Numerous reasons may be given:

- Some AMS providers charge for services based number of installations and others on the number of students at an institution. Either way, the cost per student could be reduced when a solution is implemented on a large scale that would include multiple campuses.
- The hosting site of the AMS software and the repository of assessment data is sometimes optional. For a single campus, it would be simpler and likely more cost effective to let the supplier provide hosting services. However, if more campuses were involved, a system-based hosting might make more sense not just because of reduced cost, but the system would control the security of the AMS data and could provide UH login access for consistency.
- Any system of this nature requires a personnel position to implement and improve the system over time. If each campus has its own AMS solution, each one must have an individual to provide the needed support. In a system-wide scenario, a few personnel could provide the needed support and there would be one or more colleagues in place.
to provide backup when someone is on leave or intends to change jobs. This does not preclude the possible need for each campus to have some level of AMS technology expertise.

- A system-wide application of an AMS solution would provide consistency for user interface, process and reporting. This would facilitate the assessment process for faculty and staff that work at more than one campus or change positions across campuses. Uniformity of reporting would simplify data reviewed at the system office. Reports necessary for linking outcomes assessment and demonstrated improvement between courses and programs could be standardized.

- Having a single AMS solution for the system would simplify the creation of materials used to train existing faculty, lecturers and staff during the initial phase of implementation and new faculty/staff as they are hired.

- Having all campuses implementing one AMS system would conserve effort in implementing the interoperability with Banner (e.g. approval of changes to course or program outcomes in Kuali updates Banner’s listing and dependencies of outcomes, which in turn updates the AMS for outcomes that require assessment; semester upload of course scheduling from Banner). It would also increase the likelihood that assessment completed in Laulima would be linked to the AMS system (e.g. export of Laulima assessment results for test questions or other assessed assignments). Having a common set of reports from each campus designed for system level access would assure transparent assessment of each campus's progress towards achieving goals.

- There are current models for a system-wide approach in the application of an AMS including our course management system (Laulima), student information system (Banner), curriculum management system (Curriculum Central, and soon to be KSCM) and others. Some might say this is a drawback instead given the added inertia required to get changes or updates to system-managed solutions.

**Wasn't Kuali an initial option for an AMS-like product?**

Kuali Student Curriculum Management (KSCM) was initially conceived as a possible solution to submitting, archiving and reporting assessment data. If configured to meet our needs, it could serve as a tailored AMS for our College and any of the other campuses that would choose to use it. Though using KSCM for this purpose is an extension beyond its original design, the fact that learning outcomes for both courses and programs are present and linked in course outlines and program actions, means that it already documents fundamental information that is important to every AMS solution. The functionality within KSCM allows configuration of questions related to each outcome, and submission of supporting documents or artifacts. In anticipation of demonstrating questions that would meet our College’s needs, the committee created a question sequence for submitting course and program assessment data (see Appendix 1). These questions are patterned off of our learning reports for courses and programs. There are a number of barriers that exist to using KSCM as a management system for assessment.
• Although structured forms of reporting can be created within KSCM, each must be programmed by knowledgeable staff. There is little or no ability to quickly create custom reports, an ability that’s found in most (all?) AMS software packages. Clearly, this is a potential weakness of a KSCM implementation for the purpose of assessment.

• There are other impediments to configuring KSCM for both curriculum and assessment management. An implementation planning committee exists with representatives from each campus in the system. There is an clear focus (almost myopic view) by most campus representatives on the implementation of curriculum management functionality first and foremost. The use of KSCM for assessment has been relegated to a low priority. The resistance is expressed as a concern for both a delay in the timeline for implementation and proportional cost that might require additional funding. The current opinions of the planning committee suggest that any usable form of assessment in KSCM may be in a second phase of its implementation. The current estimate for rolling out the first phase is no earlier than fall 2015. There is no estimated date for the second phase. A conversation with our College’s ALO suggests that we need to have system in place and fully functional no later than August 2016. Any delay beyond that significantly impedes our ability to demonstrate to our accrediting agency the value an AMS solution provides to our assessment process.

• Finally, additional risks exist because of certain unknowns, including those associated with developing functionality outside of KSCM’s core purpose, and working with an outside contractor that the system office manages.

What other options are there for an AMS?

There is a wide range of other options for AMS. Information about some of these options was gathered by the committee this semester. Three alternative AMS were presented to the committee during regularly scheduled meetings (see Appendix 2). In February, Alicia Brown from Leeward CC demonstrated TK20. In March, Yao Hill, formerly from Kapi‘olani and now at Mānoa, demonstrated her Excel application for tracking assessment of general education outcomes. In April, Mark Cook, also from Mānoa, demonstrated LiveText. Other sources of information were service provider webinars, an online meeting, Internet search and conversations with colleagues at other campuses. There are two general, alternative approaches that have been taken. These include the development of "home grown" software created using a customized version of a database or spreadsheet software package (e.g. Yao Hill’s solution) or the purchase of a provider-configured and supported "off-the-shelf" AMS software package (e.g. TK20 and LiveText). The committee believes that the College should choose an "off-the-shelf" solution. The "home grown" approach requires substantial initial planning and development time, is fairly manual in the configuration of scheduling and organization of outcomes for each course and program, does not readily link course-level outcomes assessment data with program-level outcomes and requires at least one dedicated personnel position to manage the software. Because of the technical expertise required for such a position, the possibility of losing the employee in that position puts the whole system at risk. Kaua‘i CC (according to Patricia McGrath) has a "home grown" system based on Microsoft's Access database software. They are happy with the system, but are losing the key person who developed it. They are now considering an "off-the-shelf" solution. Similarly, the College of
Education at Mānoa recognizes that they are solely dependent on the one person who developed their "home grown" assessment management software.

"Off -the-shelf" AMS software packages and the support services provided vary. Certain AMS suppliers are more predominant than others. They include LiveText, Taskstream, TK20, and Tracdat. Appendix 3 contains several comparison charts (multiple tabs) found on the web that compare and contrast these and other AMS options. Within the UH System, TK20 is used at Leeward Community College and LiveText is employed by several of the Culinary programs.

A survey was conducted by Sunny Pai of her ALO counterparts at other colleges. The survey seeks a variety of information about their chosen solution, costs, support, and satisfaction. Little can be said to summarize the responses since the response number is ten. Nevertheless, the responses may provide some insight when deciding which AMS our College will choose. The survey results are provided in Appendix 4.

In the absence of any progress on the system level, the committee believes that the College should establish a procedure to guide its choice of an AMS that meets it current and future needs. In order to complete a partial implementation by fall 2015, this selection process should be completed by no later than September or October 2014.

**Why is a full-time position for an Assessment Coordinator required?**

The committee recommends, at a minimum, that a position be created for an Assessment Coordinator (or Director of Assessment). The person selected for this position will be key to the successful implementation and continued maintenance of the College's AMS. Listed below are some of the Assessment Coordinator's duties specifically that would be related to an AMS. This does not exclude other duties that may be assigned to the position.

- Responsible for implementation, maintenance and improvements of AMS
- Assures that semester course offerings are uploaded to AMS
- Coordinates reporting process
- Communicates with Program Coordinators and Department Chairs about scheduling, completion and submission of assessment data, demonstration of dialogue among faculty about assessment, and documenting improvement based on assessment
- Designs training materials
- Performs professional development workshops
- Constructs online training readily available when faculty most need it
- Provides individual assistance

Appendix 5 contains sample job descriptions that may be used and insights provided by ALO colleagues of Sunny Pai.

The current method of providing teaching equivalencies to faculty members who lead and support the assessment activities at the College has worked well in the past. These multi-year responsibilities have maximized the sharing of the varied knowledge about and skills for SLO assessment of our faculty. However, as an AMS is planned and implemented, an additional
individual who is equally knowledgeable about AMS software will be essential to the College getting the most benefit out of the system it chooses.
APPENDIX 1

I. Functionality - determine use of Kuali CM for purpose of learning objective assessment
   A. Will you use Kuali CM to submit learning objective assessment reports?
      (Note: will determine if remaining parts are visible.)

II. Functionality - Entries important to learning objective assessment
   A. Ability to enter learning objective(s) as separate data elements
      
   B. Ability to link individual objectives to program, general education, institutional or other higher level outcome/objective (e.g. course to program, course to Gen Ed)
      
   C. Storage of multiple names and emails of assessment contacts who will share the responsibility of posting assessment reports (assessment coordinator, discipline coordinator, department chair or other parties)
      
   D. Academic year(s) when objective will be assessed.
      Dropdown menu Note: multiple select
      2011/2012
      2012/2013
      2013/2014
      2014/2015
      2015/2016
      2016/2017
      2017/2018
      2018/2019
      2019/2020
      
   E. Notification - Person(s) of record will receive reminder that assessment needs to be completed at prescribed time.

III. Functionality - Entries important to submission of learning objective assessment
   Note: Login required to submit assessments. Multiple faculty may submit reports based on persons of record (above)...but possibly limit editing to author?
   
   IF Course:
   cA. Learning objective assessed (choice from drop down of entered objectives and linked objectives to programs, Gen Ed, etc.)
      
   cB. Month and year assessment completed
      (two dropdown menus)
      Dropdown menu 1
      01 through 12 (or month written out)
Dropdown menu 2
Listing of prior five years and current year *(discuss needs at other campuses)*

cC: Assessment method employed
Dropdown menu Note: multiple select (if multiple options selected, each must be followed with a corresponding cD to cH)
- Test question(s) (one or more within a test, not the entire test)
- Test/Quiz (the whole assessment)
- Writing assignment
- Oral presentation/speech
- Portfolio
- Performance/demonstration
- Work of art
- Multimedia product
- Survey
- Focus group
- Observation
- External review
- Certification exam
- Other: required additional text entry (if other is selected, user should be able to enter more than one number entry? Each should have corresponding cD to cH)
  *(Will additions to assessment method choices be campus specific or system-wide? How detailed do we want to be...longer listing?)*

cD: Additional description of assessment method (optional)
Text Entry
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links

cE: Expected level of achievement
Dropdown menu
- 50%
- 60%
- 70%
- 80%
- 90%
- 100%
- Other: required additional text entry
  *(e.g. skill level, Likert scale, other format...perhaps instead this should be a dropdown menu including Percentage, Skill level, Likert scale, Other Scale and then define the scale)*

cF: Additional description of expected level of achievement (optional)
Text entry field
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links
cG: Results of assessment
Dropdown menu
   Much less than expected
   Less than expected
   Equal to expected
   Better than expected
   Much better than expected
   Other: required additional text entry

Or could be as simple as
   Less than expected
   Equal or better than expected
   Other: required additional text entry

cH: Additional description of results of assessment (optional)
Text entry field
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links

cl. Planned changes in response to assessment findings
Dropdown menu
Note: multiple select (if multiple options selected, each must be followed with a corresponding cj, "None" cannot be chosen with another)
   None
   Revise to syllabi
   Change course outline or program description(s)
   Alter teaching method(s)
   Improve student support
   Revise assessment method
   Other: required additional text entry
(Will additions to response choices be campus specific or system-wide?)

cJ: Additional description of planned changes (optional?)
Text entry field
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links

cK: Impact of any prior changes made
Text entry field

If Program: (If Gen Ed, Institution or other options? Presumably for Gen Ed outcomes that are linked to Program outcomes, Gen Ed could be simply considered as a higher level program and dealt with as follows.)

Note: Where program outcomes are linked to (and assessed by) course outcomes, all pertinent schedules, assessment methods and results should be aggregated and reported by Kuali CM. What follows is for additional forms of assessment for program outcomes.
pA. Learning objective assessed (choice from drop down of entered objectives.)

pB. Month and year assessment completed
Dropdown menu
01 through 12 (or month written out)

Dropdown menu
Listing of prior five years and current year (discuss needs at other campuses)

pC: Assessment method employed
Dropdown menu Note: multiple select (if multiple options selected, each must be
followed with a corresponding pD to pH)
- Capstone project
- Portfolio
- Other performance, display or review of student work
- Survey
- Focus group
- External review
- Certification exam
- Other: required additional text entry (if other is selected, user should be able to
enter more than one...number entry? Each should have corresponding pD to pH)
  (Will additions to assessment method choices be campus specific or system-wide?
  How detailed do we want to be...longer listing?)

pD: Additional description of assessment method (optional except for other)
Text entry field
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links

pE: Expected level of achievement
Dropdown menu
  50%
  60%
  70%
  80%
  90%
  100%
- Other: required additional text entry
  (e.g. skill level, Likert scale other format...perhaps instead this should be a dropdown
  menu including Percentage, Skill level, Likert scale, Other Scale and then define the scale)

pF: Additional description of expected level of achievement (optional)
Text entry field
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links
pG: Results of assessment
Dropdown menu
   Much less than expected
   Less than expected
   Equal to expected
   Better than expected
   Much better than expected
   Other: required additional text entry
Or could be as simple as
   Less than expected
   Equal or better than expected
   Other: required additional text entry

pH: Additional description of results of assessment (optional)
Text entry field
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links

pl: Planned changes in response to assessment findings
Dropdown menu
Note: multiple select (if multiple options selected, each must be followed with a corresponding pJ, "None" cannot be chosen with another)
   None
   Target professional development
   Alter support methods or service for students
   Acquisition or reallocation of resources
   New collaboration
   Change course outline or program description(s)
   Other: required additional text entry (if other is selected, user should be able to enter more than one...number entry? Each should have corresponding pJ)
   (Will additions to response choices be campus specific or system-wide?)

pJ: Additional description of planned changes (optional?)
Text entry field
Functionality - Allow attached files and insertion of links

pK: Impact of any prior changes made
Text entry field

IV. Suggested reporting of learning objective assessment
Tabular report of assessment reports submitted
   A. Campus
      Dropdown menu
      List of all UH system campuses
B. Course or program
Dropdown menu
  Course
  Program (Gen Ed, Institution or other options)
  (Sorted by level of degree or certificate first? Listed by Banner code? Sub-sort by major/minor/concentration?)

IF Course:
Bc1. Alpha
Dropdown menu of campus course alphas for the specific campus selected
(Could this possibly be campus specific?)

Bc2. Course number
Dropdown menu of course numbers for the specific campus selected
(Could this possibly be campus specific?)

Bc3. Beginning date for assessment completion
Calendar entry

Bc4. End date for assessment completion
Calendar entry

IF Program:
Bp1. Program name
Dropdown menu of campus programs (campus sensitive)

Bp2. Beginning date for assessment completion
Calendar entry

Bp3. End date for assessment completion
Calendar entry

Report includes listing of all learning objectives, dates of assessment completion for all objectives(Note: assessment completion date is semester and year each assessment was done and there may be more than one for each objective), flag all objectives that have not been assessed and tabular layout for assessment information including
  Objective assessed (perhaps number associated with prior listing)
  Display of assessment information submitted (Part II B through J)

Report of courses or programs not fully assessed (all objectives)
A. Campus
Dropdown menu
  List of all campuses
B. Courses or programs (Gen Ed, Institutional?)
Dropdown menu
  Courses
  Programs

IF Course:
Bc1. Selection of course groupings
Dropdown menu
  All courses (campus sensitive)
  All courses by alpha
  All courses by department
Comment: How is "department " defined? Department/Division varies from campus to campus.
  Others?

IF Courses by alpha:
Dropdown menu of all course alphas (campus sensitive) Note: multiple select

IF Courses by department:
Dropdown menu of all departments (campus sensitive)

IF Program:
Bp1. Selection of program groupings
Dropdown menu of all programs (campus sensitive) Note: multiple select to find program that is out of compliance
(If "campus sensitive" is attempted, who provides the info and how often updated?)

C. Beginning date for assessment completion)
Calendar entry

D. End date for assessment completion
Calendar entry

Report includes list of all courses/programs/Gen Ed/Institution (others?) SLOs given the selection criteria that do not have all objectives assessed within the indicated period of time and itemized the objectives not assessed.
**Questions and Suggestions**

1. Are there settings that can be changed without approval process? For example, name and email of persons who will serve as the assessment contact person and be contacted for assessment reminder. Addition of assessment methods, additions to response choices – campus admin or system admin?

2. It might be useful for program reports to pull up course level assessment reports and be organized by the assessment level (need to include assessment level as part of the data submitted).

3. How do we deal with programs that are not degree/certificate related (e.g. Gen Ed, counseling, student services, Kahikoluamea, continuing ed, etc.)? All of these have learning outcomes that need to be assessed.

4. Who has access to reviewing the assessment results? All at the same campus? Other?

5. The biggest struggle we are faced with is how to create a feedback loop so that users can easily view course and program assessment plans alongside follow-up actions, results, methods of using results for improvement. Ideally, assessment data are presented in a way that encourages participation and reflection at the course, program, and institutional levels. That way, data are referred to make decisions for course, program, and institutional improvement.
Appendix 2

Ad Hoc FS SLO Committee Summary of Presentation on TK 20

Presentation given by Alicia Brown, 455-0495, Alicia.brown@hawaii.edu

• Policy analyst for LCC, includes implementing assessment management system.

Overview:
• Bought TK20 in 2010
• Campus-wide implementation, goal was set for Fall 2014.
• Past process: assessment reports were stored online, which was inefficient. Goal was to get all assessment data and reports in system (no more stored Word documents). Reports are generated by TK20.
• Fees in 2010: 24,000, 16,000, 10,000 each year after. Based on 3,000 – 6,000 students. For Alicia, 20% - 30% of time dedicated to this project.
• TK20 maintains the server. Includes customized reports, upgrades, weekly meeting, initial training on campus.
• Question: who owns data when contract ends? Not sure. Maybe can do a yearly download.
• Live Text to be used by culinary. Appropriate for CTE programs. Systems will be merged to gain benefits of both systems.

Presentation of System:
• Alicia has a tutorial for the basics on YouTube, users have found it helpful.
• 4 levels of access: Faculty (can’t enter data), Planner (this would be for course coordinators, for example, who need to enter data), Trainer, Unit Administrator.
• TK 20 required LCC to create a hierarchy of units so that outcomes of various units can link laterally or hierarchically with other units.

Field: Outcomes/Goals. This is where to input the goals of programs, GLO, Service area outcomes. No assessment done here.
• At the beginning, they did a massive upload of course learning outcomes from curriculum central. Changes afterwards are done case-by-case over the summer by Alicia. Old outcomes get “disabled” but saved for assessment.
• Decision making selling point: Mapping (how outcomes are linked) was already set up, other systems did not have that in 2010.

Field: Assessment Planning. Data entered here.
• There are quirks, but software is always taking suggestions and improving. (# of outcomes data includes disabled assessments, and these should not be counted in the # of outcomes).
• Each campus can create its own forms for entering the data. Course coordinator will aggregate the data of all sections of a given course. Only aggregated data are entered. Both drop-down and text entry fields.
• TK20 is capable of creating reports that can synthesize data from various courses (LCC working on this next step, not there yet).
• Program level reports look like hierarchy.
• Frustration: Report templates all need to be designed by Alicia, but TK 20 people are very responsive when reports are requested. They also have a bank of report templates and make suggestions to start with similar reports from other institutions.
• All previous pre-TK20 reports were attached in Course Form, but also stored in the “Document Room.” (separate upload)

Mapping:
• Steps:
  (1) have a rich discussion to map out connections between course and program.
  (2) Manually make the connection in TK20.
• Can generate a report based on which courses have outcomes that support a particular program. (Showed example from Teaching AA).
• At this time, have to choose assessment either by mapping or by measures, but not both. But this can probably be done by adding a new tab.
• Faculty members seem to like the software, consistent trainings were given to introduce.
• Currently no specific field to indicate how many sections were assessed or percentage of total. That is a debatable topic whether or not to include such data.
• Not linked to curriculum central, banner, Laulima, etc.
Ad Hoc FS SLO Committee Summary of Presentation by Yao Hill

Presentation given by Yao Hill, yao.hill@hawaii.edu, 956-4283

- Assessment Specialist at UH Manoa

**UH Manoa Assessment website:** manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment

- Provides many assessment resources

**Overview**

- Yao will send Dawn the powerpoint presentation. Dawn will send presentation to the committee.
- UHM has an Assessment Coordinator that submits reports
- SurveyMonkey cost for secure site: $300/year
- Low-cost
- Percent time for IT programmer: 3 months (while he’s also doing other projects) – programmer doesn’t belong to research office
- Assessment experts: Yao and Monica (In Yao’s job responsibilities: 25% tool + 60% faculty dev)
- Have student assistants who help.

**Presentation of system**

- Through UHM Assessment website, faculty logs into “degree programs” (access from “reports” → “plans” → “SLOs” → “degree programs”)
- Report: A1 example
- Faculty answers questions one by one in a survey format (like open-ended survey)
- Click on separate pages at the bottom to navigate or jump around to other pages
- In order for info to be useful, someone has to look at info that was inputted. Otherwise, it’s just data.
- Someone has to look at content to figure out if the outcome inputted is actually an outcome. Human being with a technical expertise must review info (Yao and Monica’s role at UHM)
- Interface is programming someone created.
- Data inputted for questions in the system are downloaded manually into Excel.
- Use excel formulas, which helps process to go faster, but coding takes a lot of time.
- Process takes about 1-2 hours/day of work and the whole process takes about 2 months (read, code, etc.)
- Process includes collecting info on what programs are doing for assessment and data on summaries of assessment.
- Plan: will be able to upload rubrics

**Low technology solutions: Excel data-coding**

- Examples of Excel columns:
  - degree program
- developed program SLO’s (answer Y or N)
- published program SLO’s location (closed-ended answer; student helper checks if linked location is accurate)

- It’s much more difficult for other questions, so they created coding system, which resulted in a very wide spreadsheet (for example, one column is created for each evidence in Excel)

- Learning assessment evidence is not just GPA, but many others (i.e. thesis/dissertation, embedded assignment, portfolio, exhibition/performance/project, etc.)

- Question: rather than inputting codes, can’t faculty input their own?
  Answer: asked open-ended question so that faculty can write evidence the way they want. Reason for this approach is so that assessment specialists can see faculty’s view of what evidence is (qualitative data). Alternative: They can give faculty basis on where to start by using quantitative approach (i.e. checkboxes). Issue with checkboxes, however, is that faculty may not know what each checkbox means. Meaning of checkboxes may vary depending on faculty.

- Question: Did you use this to create a new course? Did you use this to create a different activity?
  Answer: Use results to provide professional development. Based on results, they create workshop topics.

Feedback on assessment reports

- Button faculty can push: “Do you want feedback on your assessment reports”
- Manoa Assessment Committee: permanent standing committee under Faculty Senate. Committee is assigned to provide feedback for those asking feedback on their reports. Each member gets 6-8 programs to provide feedback to.
- Assessment Committee members are provided guide in Laulima “Annual Report Feedback: Things to Consider/Ways to Respond.” Guide lists possible issues, provides sample language to respond.
- After committee member gives feedback, Monica and Yao review all committee members’ feedback to ensure it “hits the mark.”
- Feedback is consolidated for next year’s assessment, “Strengths and Things to Consider.”
- Bob Moeng emphasized that this process is a way to strengthen skills of faculty involved in program.

Codes for the “use” question

- Assessment-related: if rubric didn’t work, so what are the next steps
- Policy/personnel: hiring; create prerequisite
- No action needed: acknowledge and celebrate success; no need to do anything big

- Resources needed
  Manual review because requires expert judgments
• Summarize (programming language) – can ask OFIE to create program or script which can be reused regularly
• After summarize, publish results online

Different summary reports
• programs with student learning outcomes & curriculum map graph
• programs that have program SLO’s can be broken down by different colleges
• methods used to evaluate the evidence (evidence collapsed—i.e. dissertation goes under direct assessment)

Other Q & A
• Question: Concept of survey downloaded to excel—can we just develop online survey providing all options? If we will be doing in group of sections for a particular course and they want to enter in survey, what would be the easiest process to take that info in a survey and download it to excel
  
  Answer: Concern with surveymonkey: no security on who’s inputting answers. UHM’s assessment system only allows certain people to input and can only can view their own report. UHM using web data-based called with PHP interface – has programmer working on this
• Question: Why didn’t UHM buy external program?
  
  Answer: $13K was the cheapest, but still have to import manually anyway. UHM’s current system allows them to make own modifications if pay own programmer (1/5th of programmer’s responsibility). System also designed to be pre-populated for the next year.
• UHM’s plan: Each SLO (already populated) will be lined up to campus goals, program goals, etc. so faculty will be able to check off if each SLO is aligned to them.
• Question: Seems complicated for ALL our courses on campus (will be very long and wide spreadsheet). Can there be dropdown menu?
  
  Answer: Don’t have to present all columns—can use formula to simplify so wideness of Excel won’t matter
• Question: If late submittal, do you need to redo the whole thing?
  
  Answer: UHM has strict deadlines. Easiest way is to provide checkboxes. As soon as you set up all questions, can develop formulas to develop report. Can refine programming script so can run report as soon as get all data that’s needed.
• Question: Each competency has to be assessed at least once each 5 years. In order to give a final overview of the 5-year cycle, need data for all 5 years included and may be multiple kinds. How does that work?
  
  Answer: In the end, what is the reporting requirement? What does your external report need to have?
  
  Per Bob, for KapCC, it is to provide access to level of course—what the course assessment was.
Per Yao, we’re looking at summary data (how many courses fully assessed, how often). Competencies would be listed (then faculty check off which outcomes assessed this semester)

Per Bob, even if use SurveyMonkey every year, we can pull off data that combines all 5 years into Excel

- **Question**: does this first report connect to next year for next steps?  
  **Answer**: No, we hand-code. UHM currently doesn’t connect these reports to their ARPD.

  Per Bob, at program level, it is easier to track; course-level is more difficult.

**Yao’s old KapCC C4ward group**

- 1st yr: Please list the following assessment strategies you want to use.
- End of semester: What are the results? How are going to assess what you said you are going to do?
- Next year: “Have you assessed approaches?”
- Example: “Students will be able to recognize IPA” \(\rightarrow\) start with 60% \(\rightarrow\) then change intervention \(\rightarrow\) raise to 80%
- Not difficult to include to this: Respond from feedback to year before

**Yao’s recommendations**

- First engage those very interested \(\rightarrow\) spread the word \(\rightarrow\) recognize by sharing & showcase best
- For Lukewarm people: ask to participate in small group
- To create this assessment culture:
  1. Admin has to use assessment in a non-punitive way and build trust;
  2. ask deans to praise those who are doing well (basic; no-cost);
  3. can use assessment results for resource allocation (advanced)
- Example: BA Econ program @ UHM: graduates couldn’t do math \(\rightarrow\) developed Math for Economics & Social Sciences \(\rightarrow\) required all to complete + require TA’s lead smaller sections after class from big lecture hall sessions
- Faculty senate resolution: assessment cannot be used for high-stakes decisions
- Assessment is central part of teaching and learning
- Teachers shouldn’t be held accountable for achievement results – but support if contract renewal guidelines encourage faculty to use assessment
- How do we move forward using assessment?
APPENDIX 5

California Baptist University
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, PLANNING, AND ASSESSMENT
JOB DESCRIPTION: ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR

Position: Division/School /College/Department (Unit) Assessment Coordinator
Unit: All Divisions/Schools/Colleges and Departments
Reports to: VP/School/College Dean and/or Department Chairperson; coordinated with the Associate Provost for Institutional Planning, Assessment, and Research
Pay: Faculty Overload Compensation--Factors such as number of majors and programs, number of full-time faculty, and external agency or accreditation reporting requirements influence compensation decisions; maximum is 9 units overload pay per calendar year (3 each semester and 3 for summer).

MAJOR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Coordinates assessment and program review within the Unit
   a. Functions as the VP’s/Dean’s/Chair’s representative within the Unit for matters related to assessment and program review.
   b. Serves as the assessment and program review “Champion” within the Unit.
   c. Insure all academic leaders overseeing programs offered by the Unit understand CBU assessment and program review requirements and timelines.
   d. Leads the faculty and staff in developing Capacity and Student Learning Outcomes appropriate to the individual programs; facilitate compiling USO/SLO/Course Matrices.
   e. Serves as the Unit’s initial “go-to person” for answering questions and providing assistance related to assessment and program review.
   f. Insures necessary assessment and program review reports are completed correctly and submitted on time; i.e., annual planning and assessment reports, program review reports, program review follow-up reports, etc.
   g. Seeks assistance from the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment whenever required or desired.
   h. Assists the Unit in budgeting for assessment and program review needs.

2. Serves as a voting member on the University Assessment Committee
   a. Maintains consistent attendance and participation; if a rare absence is anticipated, arranges for a faculty substitute to attend the meeting.
   b. Represents the Unit’s interests and concerns to the Committee.
   c. Communicate Committee concerns and expectations to the Unit.
   d. Serves as a Program Review Liaison representing the Assessment Committee to one or more programs undergoing a program review.
3. Coordinates LiveText assessment accounts within the Unit
   a. Provides guidance and assistance for Unit faculty and staff in using LiveText for assessment and program review.
   b. Maintains a LiveText administrative account to compile Unit assessment and program review data and reports.
   c. Coordinates with Faculty Development and the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment to provide LiveText accounts and training as needed.

4. Assists VP/Dean/Chairpersons/Coordinators in annual planning and conducting assessment
   a. Makes certain Unit minutes reflect the correct assessment processes and procedures, from initial planning through completion.
   b. Assists Unit programs in determining appropriate assessment methods and data collection details (what, when, where, how, by whom, etc.).
   c. Monitors progress in completing assessment activities; encourage slow movers.
   d. Assists Unit faculty and staff as necessary with data collection, analysis, and reporting.
   e. Facilitates student involvement in the assessment processes.
   f. Coordinates as needed with the Director of Assessment and the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment.
   g. Insures Unit programs complete and submit required assessment reports in keeping with accepted CBU standards.

5. Assists VP/Dean/Chairperson/Coordinator in planning and conducting periodic Program Reviews for each major or program within the Unit
   a. Makes certain Unit minutes record decisions and actions related to correct program review processes and procedures, from initial planning through completion.
   b. Assists Unit faculty and staff as need in data collection, analysis, and reporting.
   c. Encourages as much student involvement in the process as possible.
   d. Insures actions-to-be-taken resulting from analysis based on student learning improvement are included in program review reports.
   e. Coordinates with the assigned Program Review Liaisons to make certain all Unit programs under review conduct, complete, and submit on time their Program Review Reports in keeping with the standards set forth in the CBU Program Review Handbook.
Dir Academic Assessment & Research
Institution: South University
Location: Savannah, GA
Category: Admin - Institutional Research and Planning
Admin - Assessment, Accreditation, and Compliance
Posted: 04/11/2014
Type: Full Time
Notes: marked as a Priority
Category: Academic Affairs
Division: South University
Minimum Education Required: PhD
Job Code 12183
Location: South University - Corporate Savannah, GA 31406-4805, US
Open Date: 07/19/2013
Travel Required: 0 - 20%

Job Summary:
This position provides direction and guidance for the University's ongoing academic assessment and continuous improvement efforts through the facilitation of all aspects of the University's assessment of student learning and educational program quality. The position manages the generation and distribution of standardized analytic reports and provides support for ad hoc reporting and data requests related to student learning and programmatic achievement including the support of programmatic accreditation efforts focused on assessment results. The position provides key support to assessment efforts in the academic programs through the maintenance of course embedded assessment processes (LOM) and generates standard and ad hoc reporting associated with the course embedded assessment processes. The position manages the maintenance and expansion of program-end assessments and capstone assessments for all academic programs. The position also supports all academic programs in the development of their annual Ongoing Strategic and Improvement Reports associated with University-Level student learning and program outcomes.

Incumbent must assure that the EDMC philosophy: quality services to clients; development, growth, involvement, and recognition of employees; sound economic principles; and environment which is conducive to innovation, positive thinking and expansion - is considered in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of this position.

Key Job Elements:
• Manage the academic assessment activities including the development and maintenance of assessment plans and their implementation for all academic programs, and reporting of results and assurance of continuous improvement as a result of the assessments.
• Maintains the course embedded assessment activities including reporting of results through the implementation and maintenance of the Learning Outcomes Manager tool.
• Provide oversight and management of program-end assessments including comprehensive exams (MFT, Peregrine testing, ExamSoft) and the development and expansion of capstone assessments for all programs. Assure integration of results into continuous improvement activities.
• Provide review of course level student learning outcomes in all new course and course revision activities
• Provide training on all aspects of academic assessment for University faculty and staff
• Work with South Ai campuses through their Director of IER and Dean of the College of Creative Art and Design to assure integration with South practices for academic assessment reporting
• Coordinate assessment reporting from IDEA results including managing course IDEA objective inventory and report distribution of summary results by program.
• Support the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data for the University's academic programs.
• Manage distribution of report results for graduate and employer surveys. Provide support for the refinement of these surveys for all academic programs.

Reports to: Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Interacts with: Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Chancellor; Senior Director for Institutional Effectiveness and Reporting; all college deans, assistant deans, chairs, program directors and faculty; Ai campuses-Director of IER, Dean CCAD; QEP Director; Campus Deans of Academic Affairs and Operations; University Administration.

Job Requirements:

Knowledge:
• Masters required, doctorate preferred in related field
• Five to seven years of leadership experience in student learning outcomes assessment management, institutional research, planning and effectiveness.
• Substantial experience in higher education environment preferred.
• Ability to manage multiple projects in a dynamic environment. Advanced knowledge in the assessment of student learning and academic program quality.
• Significant expertise in Office products, especially excel; experience with statistical software, student information system, and learning management systems.
• Familiarity with issues of accreditation both regional and programmatic.

Skills:
• Excellent communication skills, both verbal and written.
• Superior analytical and critical thinking ability
• Advanced ability to analyze and interpret qualitative and quantitative data
• Strong interpersonal skills with student and staff populations.
• Superior organization, prioritization, and self-motivation skills.
• Strong computer skills. MS Office Suite.

 Abilities:
• Ability to interact effectively as either a leader or as a member of a team and work collaboratively with other departments.
• Ability to manage and work with quantitative and qualitative research efforts to assess student learning with a high level of expertise.
• Ability to listen to customers (e.g. staff, etc.) and to understand and respond positively to their requests.
• Ability to adapt to changing assignments and multiple priorities.
• Ability to manage multiple tasks and successfully meet deadlines.

 Work Environment
The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable qualified individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions. The term "qualified individual with a disability" means an individual with a disability who, with or without reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the position. While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to communicate professionally in person, over the telephone, through email and other electronic means, move about the office or school, handle various types of media and equipment, and visually or otherwise identify, observe and assess. The employee is occasionally required to lift up to 10 pounds unless otherwise specified in the job description.

 Notice
The intent of this job description is to provide a representative and level of the types of duties and responsibilities that will be required of positions given this title and shall not be construed as a declaration of the total of the specific duties and responsibilities of any particular position. Employees may be directed to perform job-related tasks other than those specifically presented in this description. Education Management Corporation is an Equal Opportunity Employer and embraces diversity as a critical step in ensuring employee, student and graduate success. We are committed to building and developing a diverse environment where a variety of ideas, cultures and perspectives can thrive.
Salisbury University is seeking qualified applicants for the position of Assessment Coordinator in the University Analysis, Reporting and Assessment Office.

Primary Job Duties: Assist in the University's effort to collect data used to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of initiatives/programs/units. This includes assessing progress towards accomplishing strategic plan goals, improving assessment efforts in General Education and academic majors, training faculty and staff on assessment and evaluation methods, assessing the effectiveness of student retention and engagement initiatives, communicating assessment results, providing support and recommendations for using assessment results for institutional improvement. Additionally the position will assist with the assessment and evaluation needs of the campus to include: addressing accreditation suggestions and revisions; assessment of general education curriculum and outcomes; assisting departments with their program or major-level assessments; participation in external assessment and accountability initiatives; developing assessment plans and evaluating the success of student success, engagement, and retention initiatives; communicating and using assessment results for institutional improvement.

Minimum Qualifications: Master's degree in behavioral or social science, higher education administration or assessment and 1-3 years of related experience.

Required Knowledge/Skills/Abilities: Must be detail oriented and have excellent interpersonal, customer service, organization and planning, prioritization, problem solving, follow through, time management, and oral & written communication skills. Also, must be flexible and possess the ability to successfully handle multiple tasks/projects simultaneously and work well under pressure, independently, and in a team-oriented environment. Excellent analytical skills with the ability to provide support for projects in the areas of: program assessment, accountability, and institutional effectiveness; expertise in basic statistics, database/spreadsheet management, and data analysis and manipulation (using SPSS and Excel) Proficiency with Microsoft Office Suite (Outlook, Word, Excel and PowerPoint) is required.

This is a full-time exempt State position with a full benefits package. Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications.
Assessment Coordinator Position:
The Assessment Coordinator will manage the development and implementation of a comprehensive program of assessment for the purpose of institutional improvements in accordance with accreditation requirements in support of institutional effectiveness. The Assessment Coordinator must work with the SLO committee, faculty, staff and administrators to develop effective strategies for the academic assessment of student learning outcomes at the general education and program levels. The assessment coordinator will provide ongoing support for assessment activities, assist with the analysis of assessment methods and results and report such results to both internal and external stakeholders. The Assessment Coordinator will coordinate the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of all academic, support, and administrative units.

Job Responsibilities:
• Work with Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and SLO committee to further develop assessment plan. Connect plan to AS and AA degrees.
• Work with SLO training committee through on-going flex workshops for programs, interdisciplinary committees, departments, divisions or individuals to:
• Develop SLOs and Service Outcomes (SO) and benchmarks and rubrics
• Present assessment plan
• Work with General Education committees and programs to:
• Collect evidence – design assessment tool, collect student work
• Analyze evidence – make summative judgments relative to SLO
• Document analysis in report (develop template for reports)
• Implement Changes
• Work with non instructional and academic support units to develop and assess service outcomes and develop reporting forms if they do not exist.
• Develop statistical models to measure impact of learning support services on student achievement of intended learning outcomes.
• Develop item analysis reports as necessary to help faculty evaluate the effectiveness of tests and test items.
• Conduct focus groups with students and/or faculty and staff to get insight into practices that work and those that do not.
• Work with SLO committee to problem-solve issues that arise with assessment plan and present solutions to appropriate bodies.
• Work with continuing education coordinators to develop SLOs
• Work with the accreditation liaison officer and assist with accreditation activities
• Create reporting forms for assessment activities on campus
• Work with SLO information committee to disseminate reports and archive assessment activities
• Serve as a repository for evidence and reports.

Has knowledge of:
• Accreditation standards
• Student learning outcomes
• Assessment practices and methods
• Assessment plan for college
• Pedagogy – practice and study of teaching
• Learning theory – practice and study of learning
• Rubrics
• Statistics
• Psychometrics
• SPSS, SAS, BILOG, and MULTILOG

Able to:
• Facilitate work groups
• Organize
• Problem solve
• Plan
• Communicate and present
• Provide resources
• Monitor assessment process
• Collaborate with others
• Coordinate
• Lead
• Collect, analyze, and interpret data
• Train others on complex processes
HawCC Institutional Assessment Coordinator (revised by AC, 12-1-2010)

The HawCC Institutional Assessment Coordinator works closely with administrators, campus divisions/units, and faculty/staff to design and implement a comprehensive program of institutional-wide assessment that will enhance academic decision making, promote continuous quality program and service improvement, and meet standards of accreditation.

Job Responsibilities and Duties: Under the general supervision of the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs/Chief Academic Officer (VCAA/CAO):

1. Works collaboratively with all members of the College community to enhance and accomplish the organizational mission of the College and serves on the College Council.

2. Provides training and support to all faculty and staff through on-going workshops, such as E `Imi Pono Day; division, departmental and unit meetings; and individual sessions to:
   - Assess and align course, program and institutional learning outcomes
   - Write learning or service outcomes for individual courses, programs and units
   - Create assessment plans, tools, and strategies
   - Implement assessment plans
   - Use assessment data for planning

3. Assists the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs in the Comprehensive Program Review College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC) process.

4. Engages in other special assessment and institutional effectiveness projects; uses ingenuity to isolate, define, and characterize critical features of problems and recommend solutions; recommends constructive ideas to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity within a specialty area or the College.

5. Oversees assessment documentation including the content of the assessment webpage, due dates, schedules and templates.


7. Convenes and facilitates an assessment advisory committee, as needed.

8. Submits an annual report to the VCAA/CAO.

9. Other duties as assigned.

Minimum Qualifications:

Master's Degree from an accredited institution.

Five years of teaching experience at a community college, at least two of which must include assessment experience.

Desirable Qualifications:

At least three years in a leadership position involving assessment of student learning outcomes and/or program review processes

Well developed familiarity with methods of curriculum design, learning outcomes, teaching effectiveness assessment, and program evaluation
Awareness of national trends related to assessment and educational research, particularly related to higher education
Exceptional communication skills
Experience working with diverse groups
Knowledge of quantitative/qualitative research skills
Hi Sunny.

Hawaii CC hired an assessment coordinator. I'll attach the job description and MQs I was given at an AAA meeting.

In my experience, implementing an AMS and being responsible for assessment coordination are two different positions. Obviously they work together, but I don't think one person could do everything in your list. I rely heavily on Alicia to handle the implementation of our AMS. She assists with training, but I need someone else to handle overall coordination. Also, the AMS needs a technical expertise that your assessment coordinator most likely won't need to have. The coordinator needs to have strong interpersonal skills. :-) 

Della

**********************************************************
From: Diane Meyer <dianemey@hawaii.edu>
Date: Tue, Apr 22, 2014 at 2:07 PM
Subject: Re: Assessment experts
To: Sunyeen Pai <sunyeen@hawaii.edu>

We at Maui College have two faculty each with 3 cr. reassigned time per semester for assessment. One faculty handles the assessment for the CTE programs. Her duties include advise program coordinators on assessment and program review; attend curriculum meetings to offer advice on course and program learning outcomes; attend Strategic Planning and Assessment meetings.

The other faculty handles the Collegewide Academic Student Learning Outcomes (CASLO) for all the programs. He runs CASLO committee meetings periodically throughout the year; advises program coordinators in selecting courses for CASLO assessment; assign courses for CASLO assessment; notify faculty of selection for participation in CASLO assessment; collect evidence of students' learning for CASLO assessment; organize and facilitate CASLO assessment meetings for each program to include student member, advisory committee member, program faculty; set up online surveys to collect responses to student learning; create CASLO assessment reports for each program; maintain CASLO Laulima site to present assessment evidence and reports.

These two individuals are doing an outstanding job and are passionate about assessment, which is contagious amongst our faculty.

Diane Meyer
Maui College
**************************************************

On Tue, Apr 22, 2014 at 3:13 PM, Frankie Harriss <frankieh@comfsm.fm> wrote:

Dear Sunny,

I would echo Della’s comments that your assessment coordinator would not have responsibility for implementation, maintenance, and necessarily improvements of the AMS. My dept (Institutional Effectiveness & Quality Assurance) just happens to be organised such that the IT office and IR office are under me. We moved our assessment coordinator position from instruction and placed them under my department (especially as we do nonacademic program assessment as well), and I added on duties for the assessment coordinator to serve as an assistant ALO as well (it was a nice fit and also enticed the individual I was actively recruiting to apply for the position).

Not sure our description would work under a different organisational structure, however. Our assessment coordinator obtains assistance from both the IT office and IR office regarding the AMS (TracDat). These offices coordinated to research systems, adopt a system, determine the setup best for us, and to implement. Your assessment person needs to be well respected (especially among the faculty) and to work really well with others, in my opinion, for them to be successful. My IT and IR guys are not people folks. :) I am not sure you would get your first bullet point skill set plus all the assessment pieces in one, effective human. This is not necessarily a skill set or training track that comes in one person.

I would perhaps change that first bullet to something along the lines of the assessment coordinator (AC) needing to collaborate with relevant positions (tech office, other) towards implementation, maintenance, and improvements of the AMS.

Advanced mitigation hint:
I am not sure how you mitigate this item specifically in your job description, but it would benefit your AC, if you make it very clear the AC is collaborating, coordinating, and assisting, but NOT doing everyone’s assessment work for them. The largest misconception we had to undo over this last year is that having an AC does not mean that individual now does your assessment work for you. You did list that the AC, “coordinates the reporting process,” but it might be more worthwhile to be very explicit on with whom they coordinate and specifically what the AC coordinates so the role is clear. I am not sure if perhaps your next bullet on communicating is specifically what is meant by the previous bullet? If these are different things, I would do exactly as you did with the Communicates bullet...be explicit. And/or be sure to start communicating this concept (the AC does not do your assessment work for you) now, to your faculty senate.

For what reports does the AC position have responsibility, if any? student learning outcomes: institutional, program, course level and support services? Or coordinates course, program, and support service SLO assessments/improvement plans and only has responsibility to generate some institutional assessment reports (comprehensive)? For example, our AC is
responsible for two comprehensive reports: institutional annual assessment report (taken from data others must input-similar go GCC’s annual assessment report) and another on institutional student learning outcomes (taken from data others collect, but the AC must design and drive that data collection process). For all other reports, the AC merely coordinates, collaborates, and assists.

Additionally, our AC has primary lead for assessment of the gen ed courses, as our gen ed is not a true program, crosses several programs and divisions, and thus benefits from an identified lead person.

Apologies for a scattered response, but just a few items for you to consider.

Kind regards - Frankie