

Assessment Plan – Open Forum

April 20, 2017

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Tamarind Room, Ohelo Building

Facilitator: Louise Pagotto, Interim Chancellor

Introduction: Joanne Whitaker, Accreditation Liaison Officer

- The open forum is an opportunity to receive your feedback. This is the second forum.
- Timeline –
 - There are two open forums on April 19 and 20, 2017, a meeting with the Math and Science dept. on April 28, and a Google form to collect written comments will be available until April 28.
 - All comments will be consolidated and the plan will be revised in the summer
 - The revised assessment plan will be presented in the fall.
- The goal is to identify 2-3 things that can be completed in 2017-2018.
- How the plan was created.
 - In the fall 2016, the co-chairs for the ACCJC Institutional Self-Evaluation report worked with the Faculty Senate SLO committee and the Chair of the SLO committee to frame an assessment plan.
 - It was determined that the more effective role of the SLO committee would be to vet the plan. Sally Pestana and Tanya Renner, who have deep knowledge of assessment and accreditation, were asked to draft a plan balancing the requirements of ACCJC accreditation and a more organic approach to assessment.
 - Sally and Tanya interviewed the following to collect information for the Plan: (page 2 of the Assessment Plan)
 - Taskstream Coordinator,
 - General Education Board members,
 - CTE Assessment Coach,
 - Arts & Sciences Coach,
 - Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcome Committee,
 - Accreditation Liaison Officer,
 - College Accreditation Consultant, and
 - Various other faculty and staff working on assessment
- Here are the requirements for accreditation:
 - All courses need outcomes
 - All course outcomes need to be mapped to program, general education (if applicable) and institutional outcomes
 - All outcomes need to be assessed but not all outcomes need to be assessed on the same timeline.

- There will be a cycle for assessment like the 5-year curriculum review process
- How we approach the process will be Kapi'olani's story. We need to ensure that students are learning what we think they are learning

Feedback on the Assessment Plan:

- A reading of a faculty member's letter: Paraphrasing sections:
 - The lie is that we are not doing assessment so we need to create a complex process. We all assess. We figure how our students are learning. Is it broken?
 - The process is will add unnecessary work.
 - Many of our students are doing amazing work. We have high standards. We are a college – we expect students have passed high school. We are an open access but inspire students who
 - Creative critical thinkers – explore discovering
 - How do we evaluate this? Not a check box. Process will not improve our teaching and create a bureaucracy. Data is meaningless.
 - John objects to the machinery. The process happens everyday in the classroom. Need to send that message.
- Chair of SLO committee: getting a lot of pushback from the Math/Science dept. Feedback received from her department:
 - We are hired as field experts, not counters and assessment.
 - Amy got into a place fashioned it into a different vision where we just need to capture it.
 - As scientists we work as reductionists and work on one variable at a time. Assessing all SLOs dilutes these efforts in order to produce metadata. Faculty feel pressured to cut out SLOs just to meet these goals.
 - The policies that are coming down from the top make comprehensive assessment impossible.
 - One page inquiry-based assessment. Look at the ones that are meaningful or deficient or ones that we can move the needle on. Assessing all of them, and diluting the efforts, just to produce meta-data, does not make sense.
- Large reservations – 25 pages vs. one. Many of the policies are comprehensive. We teach 4-6 classes, 4-6 preps. Can't manage all the SLOs.
- Some remove their SLOs to lessen the work. IF do all the SLOS, it will dilute their work.
- Assessing constantly anyway. Can we make a case to ACCJC to allow for this inquiry based method? Can someone be a scribe for the dept to capture the discussion of the data? How to capture the information.
- The institution needs to aggregate in some way because we have to report?
- Doctors meet with patients but have to write down notes.
- Extra documentation is difficult.

- Not just quantifying to report how the students are learning.
- CTE program have a reason to look globally at the courses and how they fit in. Arts and Sciences are thinking about the course. Not looking at the courses in context of if students are achieving their outcomes. Gen Ed outcomes. Biotech CA – are they getting to the program outcomes. How do you know that?
- This kind of assessment ruins creativity and freedom.
- The ARPD stats are not authentic.
- Outcomes for the Biotech CA. How would you go about knowing that the students are getting the outcomes?
- Different exercise in A&S since the CTE courses need to add up to the program.
- It's not authentic, not meaningful, tedious and does not improve the student.
- Evidence needs to be produced and
- Amy was winning them over. Capture the conversation – quantitative and qualitative. IF this is brought to us, we know how to strip it to maintain our workload. For STEM, it comes from the faculty – collaboration and grants. Faculty know what they are doing for student success. Inquiry based policy – seeing an issue, looking deeper and improving.
- Scientific method. The inquiry based model is compatible with assessment.
- A&P, certain same exam questions. Did all do well? Celebrate successes. Is it the exam question, assignment?
- It may be badly framed and prescriptive. Too complicated. Strip it down. Take away layers.
- Data was analyzed, summarized and submitted. Just checking the box. Amy made it more meaningful and personal. She was starting to lead us in the path.
- SUO – support unit outcomes. What are they? SAOs is what the Student Affairs calls them. The authors of the plan felt that “area” is not the term we used, we use units. Simple bifurcation in 2 – there are learning outcomes in student affairs and library services. Student affairs doesn't only do service outcomes.
- Noeau and Ana are collecting comments. Trying to do learning outcomes with some of the programs. What is expected. How do you assess student learning outcomes.
- Student Parents Program assessment. They do info sessions to inquire about college. Beginning the process to learn how to be a student here. We ask them to come up with plans after they meet. Does their plan make sense for financial aid, housing? Can they get the right kinds of information.
 - We meet periodically with students about their plans. Students need extra coaching.
 - How do you measure learning: Most of the outcomes are self-reported. They have to demonstrate their learning by applying principles. . Financial aid – check if FAFSA is done, check if they have the necessary funds.
- From the student services perspective, the plan discounted a lot of efforts made by Student Affairs developing and assessing SLOs. When the SUO concept came in, it seemed like more work was added without acknowledging the work done.

- Math – challenge in assessing. Merger is making it difficult. Kahikoluamea and math go in different directions. Course objectives at the end of the semester during the final is supposed to assess the course but it is not a good measure to know what the students are learning. Is the data meaningful. Should there be course objectives or move to a more general SLO. They redid many courses. In constant flux. Still a divide between Kahikoluamea and college math. Earlier you would find one person in charge of four courses. That was too much work. Now you have faculty in charge of two courses. People are cutting corners, holding off on assessment until the last year of the cycle. Now one person can be in charge of one course. All the ways we did it before are not applicable any longer.
- Assessing one course over the 5 period, just assess it in the one year. Kahikoluamea looked at 2-3 objectives in one year, then did the other 2-3 objectives, not following up on improvement. No one uses the data for anything, it's not meaningful.
- If you are trying to get through all the SLOs you are not going to double-check your assessments. Faculty do not get called out for not assessing all the learning outcomes.
- Pilot projects – very targeted things. This course is better, what does it mean? One course to the next course in the sequence, how do they do from one course to the other.
- Semester's end exam – from a writing perspective, use portfolios. Piling their work to show work throughout.
- Self-paced model was being assessed regularly – its not a snapshot but work over time. It was a flipped class. Upper level classes are not embracing flipped classes.
- Teach a math course, do you let everyone take it or just the folks that complete the class. Some students don't come the entire semester and take the exam, it skews the data.
- We are being judged for things? When do the faculty get judged? Need the option to withdraw students who don't come to class. For learning, you will only get artifacts from students who are attending. There is pressure to not withdraw students.
- The goal is not to pin the student's achievement to the faculty. It's to see how students are doing across multiple sections. WE are trying to work on it. We have a smaller test for some equations and students will do well. Then they do very poorly on the final exam. Math is unsure about what tool can be used to assess students.
- What role can OFIE play to help sort out some of the issues? They can use only what's in Banner. No access to learning outcomes data. Math dept. is looking at not how many passed the course but how they do in the next courses. OFIE is developing a data form that will accept regular data requests.
- STAR data – hard to sort and filter the data.
- Faculty should be able to decide on inquiry-based data.

- Created by 15 members of the SLO committee. We change so much at one time. Hard to get meaningful data.
- Standard II – not written. However, visits and training and Kazama, that the expectation is that all is
- Going to 0 to all SLOs, the transition based on inquiry based method, is good.
- DSSO learning. They do SLOs and SAOs. Not an either or thing. Areas can do both.
- Tony – inquiry based is quality vs. quantity. Can't imagine pushback from ACCJC, if we're having regular conversations on SLOs.
- If we can document that we have continuous quality improvement. Need to find a way to collect the conversations. The cycle is a goal. If we have to say we have a 5-year cycle. Will there be repercussions on not doing the cycle? The requiring of a cycle is creating angst. We can we have both. Improvement is the goal. LP looks for assessments that lead to improvement. Only found 3.
- Meet regularly – every semester, every duty week. Capture conversations to put into Taskstream.
- Accreditation issue – distinction from what is written in the standards and what we are told in training. If we have an alternate plan, we want to float it with ACCJC before we go to it. Peers come out. Commission is creating the culture that trains the team.
- Explain to the ACCJC – how well are the students learning.
- Taskstream approach. Meaningful short term completion. How can we frame out assessment. One size fits all approach – push back. Need a way to frame it so that there is room for people to tell their story.
- We should move from quantity to quality. Are we not meeting the continuous improvement rubric? If we can capture those conversations and show that the departments are discussing learning outcomes
 - If courses meet once a semester and drop it into Taskstream—wouldn't that be sufficient?
- Inquiry based method – go with it. Do what is meaningful to us. You're not telling us no. Try to convince them. Use the language of the accreditation standards to make our case. Does not violate the restrictions. Not a one size fits all. It's an option. The spirit is continuous improvement. Go with something that is simple.
- Support assessment coordinator. Create prof. dev. around assessment.
- What is the role of the assessment coordinator? Don't need someone who will tell you what to do. But support to get data.
- Faculty are hired as subject matter experts, not assessment.
- Do not use our resources on all the proposed coordinators.
- Perhaps use a floating coordinator implementing a simpler plan.