Accompanying documents are highlighted in red and can be found bulleted below this memo on the Assessment Committee Webpage.

The Chair of the Committee report the following have taken place in Fall term of 2010.

1. **“Defining” Assessment**

   The Assessment Committee has met with Chancellor Straney regarding clarification of the role of Assessment on Campus. The Committee has also hosted 2 members of the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy. Based on these interactions, the following goals were generated:

   A. Let’s start working on building a *culture of trust and evidence-based decision-making*;

   B. Let’s start working on building a culture of inquiry based on the premise: Assessment is a *means of gathering information to strengthen programs*;

   C. Let’s start getting the word out: Assessment is *NOT* about targeting individual faculty or punishing programs; *ASSESSMENT SHOULD NOT BE PUNITIVE*;

   D. Let’s start demonstrating *simple, sustainable and meaningful* forms of assessment; and in conjunction with that, let’s start having conversations with our colleagues in our departments and start small scale work (in other words, think big but start small).

   E. Let’s make the case that one *size may not fit all*, and that each and every program *should be allowed to develop methods that work for them*; in the case of GE, we can should start *seeking consensus amongst ourselves in identifying the most *basic*, *common definitions of competencies* in areas like critical thinking. We can further ignite our discussions by reviewing the AAC&U’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise Initiative (LEAP). Please refer to the “AAC&U’s LEAP”;

   F. *Let’s agree to work together*, faculty and administration, in shifting the focus of assessment away from simply providing meaningless numbers for accreditation to *meaningful use of information to improve student learning*.

By aggregating the more important aspects of these bulleted items, it becomes clear that assessment entails: developing a culture of trust and consensus; developing a culture of evidence-based decision-making; communicating the belief that assessment is never punitive but simply a means of generating useful information on what our students are learning; developing simple, sustainable and meaningful methods of evidence-gathering that makes sense to all stakeholders; and allowing for flexibility per program needs.

**Ultimately, we need to start moving away from Assessment as Accountability and start moving towards Assessment as a Culture of Continual Improvement. Please**
2. “Doing” Assessment

Three sub-committees are currently working to (A) revise and test-pilot the GE Diversity Rubric, (B) revise the GE Quantitative Reasoning rubric, and (B) generate “benchmarks” for freshman writing.

Sub-committee A: Initial deployment of the GE Diversity rubric developed in February was undertaken in August in ENG 475 Queer Studies and ED 473 Elementary Literacy/Language Arts/Social Studies. The results were mixed indicating that the rubric needed revision to make it more accessible for students. In response, a subcommittee was formed to undertake that revision. Members are: Seri Luangphinith (Chair), Keola Donaghy (Ka Haka ‘Ula), Ginger Hamilton (Student Services), Jing Yin (Communication), Lauri Sagle (English), Shawon Rahman (Computer Science), Emalani Case (Ka Haka ‘Ula), Kerri Inglis (History), Sarah Marusek (Political Science), and Fiona McCormack (Anthropology). The committee has revised 2 out of 4 descriptors and will be finishing the remaining 2 categories next term, with the intent of incorporating global/multicultural values along with indigenous perspectives; our rubric is using the AACU’s Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric. A synopsis of the process is being developed for presentation to the AAC&U’s Global Positioning Conference in January.

Sub-committee B: Seri Luangphinith (Chair), Lorna Tsutsumi (CAFNRM), Mitch Anderson (Math), and John Hamilton (Physics) met in October to revise and simplify the Quantitative Reasoning and Scientific Methodology Rubric, which is attached. The rubric entails Analysis, Calculations, and Visual Representations of Data to represent Quantitative Skills; the right hand column represents Scientific Methodology. Both sets of skills are incorporated into this rubric to show the relationship between science and math as many classes/disciplines will report on both sides of the double line. John Hamilton has volunteered to lead the test-piloting come Spring Term. Please refer to the Draft Rubric for Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning.

Sub-committee C: English/writing teachers representing Hilo High School, Waiākea High School, Hawai‘i Community College and the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo have come together to evaluate what is known as the “freshman writing gap” and build consensus over what constitutes transferable academic writing. The assignment known as the Senior Project was targeted as a possible benchmark artifact given DOE discussions to make this a mandatory requirement for all graduating seniors in 2018 (the Senior Project entails a research-based document and portfolio that is currently required for the BOE Diploma). Surveys were undertaken at all 4 institutions in September—they included the faculty, students currently undertaking the Senior Project, and students currently enrolled in ENG 100 or 100T at both HAWCC and UHH. A follow-up survey for the students of ENG 100 is being collected. A consortium of participating teachers will meet on December 20 to assess a sampling of writing from freshman students who will have completed both the Senior Project and ENG 100 by the end of this term. The committee includes: Seri Luangphinith (Chair), Karla
Hayashi (UHH Writing Director), Caroline Naguwa (HAWCC), Lauri Sagle (UHH), Susan Wackerbarth (UHH), Kirsten Mollegaard (UHH), Francine Whitehead (Hilo HS), and Shellie Naungayan (Wieaїkea HS). Results of the surveys and direct readings (which should be ready by the next Congress meeting) have been proposed for presentation at the upcoming WASC ARC.

The larger Committee will convene with the additional membership of Errol Yudko and Susan Brown to work on simplifying the GE Critical Thinking Rubric next term.

Keola Donaghy and Hank Hennessey will be working together to evaluate the possibility of developing an eportfolio for use as a virtual repository of student learning that can (1) help student and teachers track student performance over time, and (2) can be accessed for assessment purposes. Discussions are currently ongoing to possibly test such a system by linking ENG 100 courses with HAWST 111 in the future. To help us with our evaluations of software and platforms, the Assessment Committee (per monies from the VCAA’s Office) will be hosting KCC’s Mary Hattori, who was part of the development of their nationally cited eportfolio.

Our student representatives, Kyle Fuhriman and Lindsay Brown, will be developing methods for educating students about assessment and soliciting student buy-in. I have asked that they work closely with Keola and Hank to ensure that recommendations of any platform be vetted for user (student) friendliness.

As a side note, the GE Information Literacy and the GE Communication rubrics have been formalized and have been inserted to follow the GE Quantitative Reasoning Rubric. They have been adopted by the English Department’s Scholarship (Droste Endowment Fund) Committee for use in evaluating student submissions. Sub-committee C will be using them on December 20 for their reading (benchmarking) of freshman work. Please refer to the Draft Rubric for Information Literacy and the Draft Rubric for Communication.

3. Other Business

Attached is the campus report for Cal State University, San Marcos. Please refer to “Evaluation of UHH Peer Institution.”

As part of the requirements for the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy, the Committee Chair was required to profile assessment and accreditation processes at what is considered our benchmark institution. Given the reporter’s finding, the following represents salient lessons for us here at UHH:

A. Positive change with regard to assessment did not happen until faculty and administration could agree on making the process for GE assessment and Program Review meaningful. Per the Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow: “the success of Program Review resides in the continual striving for what is ‘beneficial’ as opposed to what is ‘ideal.’”

B. Buy-in for faculty is an absolute necessity. CSUSM accomplished this by providing summer stipends, yearly monetary incentive for departments, and release times for key department leaders in assessment. They also make it a point to send people for the required training they needed. This is also the
reason why over 100 people are involved in the writing of accreditation documents.

C. Assessment is actually run by two faculty-chosen leaders. The respect they have earned from their peers was pivotal in their selection by administration to serve the larger community.

D. GE assessment work because CSUSM have simplified the process to include just 2 goals—information literacy and effective communication. They also engage the process from the vantage point of what is “minimally” acceptable to serve as the basis for interdisciplinary competencies.

E. Their GE was mandated to map onto the AAC&U’s LEAP initiative. While there was some initial reservations about this, the majority of the faculty found this external guidance (authority) gave their work academic credence.