TO: UHH Faculty Congress

FROM: Seri Luangphinith
Chair, Assessment Support Committee

CC: Don Straney, Chancellor
Kenith Simmons, Interim VCAA
April Komenaka, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Jim Beets, Chair, Faculty Congress

RE: Annual Report of the Assessment Support Committee (AY 2011-2012)

DATE: May 11, 2012

As Chair of the Assessment Support Committee, I hereby submit the following report on accomplishments of the year and plans for the next.

Faculty Training in Assessment

The following members of the university were asked to participate in the WASC Assessment 101 one-day training In February. Those selected were key faculty who serve on either the GE or Assessment Committees. Some also serve as program or department chairs; most teach General Education courses.

Norman Arancon—CAFNRM
Errol Yudko—Psychology (CAS)
Reni Ivanova—Math (CAS)
Shawon Rahman—Computer Science (CAS)
Jonathan Awaya—Biology (CAS)
Sarah Marusek—Political Science (CAS)
Fiona McCormack—Anthropology (CAS)
Jonathan Price—Geography (CAS)
Kathleen Stacey—Library

In subsequent meetings since then, they (along with other members of the Assessment Support Committee) identified a number of initiatives that can be undertaken in the coming academic year:

1. Work on calibration by identifying "anchor" papers/artifacts that create baseline expectations vis-à-vis our 4 set rubrics.
2. Establishing baselines for all levels, 100 through the 400. Then beginning the year after (2013-2014), start assessing selected student artifacts—one (1) rubric at a time (given that the rubrics

have critical thinking built into them, we'll be pulling numbers for two skills every year). We can start evaluating batches of papers from volunteers to help establish baselines.
3. Develop a website to house WASC standards, our rubrics, all committee reports, baseline artifacts, curriculum matrix, an anonymous Q&A board, etc.
4. Start working on a curriculum map by seeing what departments have done in terms of their GE offerings. This should also help us start the process of determining levels of performance appropriate to each level in GE.
5. Start getting faculty in their classes to use these rubrics and start self reporting on the numbers to initiate a habit of integrating them into everyday practice.
6. Identify resources that we faculty will need to do what we need to do (i.e. course release for someone to do data management, stipends for readers of papers, etc.)

Following up on these ideas will be the job of the Assessment Support Committee for the next academic year. However, it is important for members of the committee to do some leg work this summer to at least establish a ***minimum*** budget (for photocopying, books, student work assistance) to help us plan for this over the next year.

Program Review Revision

Thanks to mentorship from Linda Buckley, Associate VP of Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness at SFSU, and Amy Driscoll, Associate Senior scholar with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, our sub-committee tasked with revising the Program Review guidelines has met its goals. Attached is the draft, which, in the spirit of our new Strategic Plan, ties WASC mandated assessment to our sense of community and shared learning. Rather than setting prescriptive page lengths for sections, the narratives within this document attempt to explain the importance of these requirements in a manner that is meaningful to both faculty and administration. Those undertaking Program Review should feel free to adapt these guidelines to best fit their goals and missions.

Rather than having Department and Programs scramble once every 7 years with little or no thought about the process, we decided to encourage everyone to do small assessments and yearly reviews (1-2 pages) that can be compiled into the one longer, final Program Review at the end of the cycle. This keeps the channel of communication open between all parties and it allows for intervention at earlier times to avert larger crises.

Please keep in mind that the data section is not negotiable. Many of the numbers are required on a system level; however, we hope that our narratives explain how they can be made useful for faculty and our local administration.

So far, we have gotten very positive feedback from Kalena Silva, Director for the College of Hawaiian Language, and Ernie Kho, Chair of Chemistry (please refer to Ernie's email which is attached).

To ease the transition into this new document, the Chair of Assessment has asked four members of this sub-committee—Todd Belt, Chair of Political Science; Michael Bitter, Chair of History; Mark Panek, Chair of English; and Mitch Anderson, former Chair of Mathematics—to serve as an exploratory group to touch base with other Chairs and to develop the mechanisms and protocol for how such a group would function in peer-mentoring and evaluating these documents. We envision the eventual creation of an Academic Program Review Advisory Committee, to be constituted by those who are tasked with

Program Review to not only help advise Chairs who are new to both assessment and program review, but to also provide input to administration on the efficacy of the overall processes.

The sub-committee understands that this document needs to be vetted by the larger campus and by administration. However, we ask that all revisions be directed back to the sub-committee, which will continue to work with our WASC mentors to ensure that proposed changes are consistent with accreditation standards.

And one last note. The Chair was contacted by Amy Driscoll, who has expressed an interest in using parts of this document (especially the cover page) in a new publication for WASC (see second attachment). This is still just a preliminary interest. As more details are made clearer, they will be reported back to the Committee and to Congress.

The Chair of the Assessment Support Committee would like to thank the following people for their tireless efforts on what is now the 7th iteration:

Todd Belt, CAS—Political Science
Mitch Anderson, CAS—Mathematics
Michael Bitter, CAS—History
Mark Panek, CAS—English
Terry Jalbert, CoBE
Keola Donaghy, CHL
Karla Hayashi, Kilohana

The Chair expresses special thanks to Keola Donaghy, who has been with this and other projects since the Fall of 2009.

Seri Luangphinith

From: Ernest Kho [ekho@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2012 8:27 AM
To: Seri Luangphinith
Subject: Re: reminder, meeting tomorrow at 4:30

Seri,

Sorry, I won't be able to make it today but I do have a couple of comments.

1. On page 6, insert (IR) after Institutional Research

Hopefully this information will be forthcoming from the Institutional Researcher as with all the data that is needed.

Wow! The document is fantastic. The committee did excellent work. This should make doing the PR straightforward, especially with the addition of an annual review. Departments can track their own progress and then submit the compiled version for longer PR cycle. The key will be the availability of the quantitative data which I know is available but not easy to access. When we adopt this format and the Institutional Researcher can be instructed to produce this information, then the whole process becomes useful in my opinion. When the PR is submitted to the administration, they will all look very similar from the data standpoint anyway. The narratives will be unique and showing the "flavor" of each department.

I like it. I was dreading this all along, but this "process" engages the departments to participate and hopefully improve on their mission, ILO's and goals.

The next step IMHO, is to create the "sample" document with a real department. I'm not volunteering. I'd like to see that sample before I start. Who else is on the PR list? May I suggest a streamlined boiler plate with the appropriate data sets, that would help to initiate the process. Also I think that all these PR's should be available for faculty so that they can see what other departments are doing and so they have a reference for their own review and assessment. There may be other colleagues out there that are interested or writing their PR's.

Hope this is helpful.

Ernie

Seri Luangphinith

From: amym.driscoll@
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2012 6:05 AM
To: Seri Luangphinith
Subject: Re:

I'm okay - I would like a copy of that front page of your learning outcomes document with the mission statement on it and beautiful graphics - I am writing a new book and want to use it as an example. Okay with you - permission? Amy I'll do a formal permission form later when I am close to publication.)*

From: "Seri Luangphinith" <seri@hawaii.edu>
To: "amym driscoll" <amym.driscoll@ >
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2012 12:59:12 PM
Subject: hope you are well

Hi Amy,

S