Updates from those Working on Assessment and Accreditation
The writers of recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 have completed their second drafts.

The ACCJC convened a DQP (Degree Qualifications Profile) conference. Charles Sasaki and his team were responsible for aligning our five general education outcomes with the DQP profile. It was discovered that the general education outcomes were difficult to assess. They narrowed the focus to the Hawaiian Studies degree. The Hawaiian Studies faculty looked at the program outcomes, DQP outcomes and aligned their course outcomes to them. The program outcomes were slightly revised to improve the alignment. It was a year-long project with representation from 16 institutions. Three of the 16 were nominated and Kapiolani CC was given an award for excellence. It was a hypothetical exercise but it may be the impetus to start a conversation.

At the last ACCJC annual report, there was a question that asked how many programs outcomes aligned to institutional outcomes. The college has stated that the general education outcomes are the same as our institutional outcomes. However, aligning the CTE programs were difficult. There needs to be a stronger alignment between institution outcomes to course and program outcomes. This must also extend to the majors and student services.

Kapiolani CC has achieved the highest transfer rate in the college’s history. Over 30% of our students transfer to a 4-year college in the UH system. These are great performance measures that are part of our story and need to be communicated.

The new standards will be finalized in July 2014 and will be effective as of June 2016. There is less redundancy and a section was added on integrity. Instead of 16 eligibility requirements, there will be 5 and a crosswalk will be created.

A comment was made on the writing of the drafts. More evidence is needed. The budget planning process seems it may be setting people up for disappointment especially if no requests are funded. More context is needed on our institutional priorities. We need to look at the strategic plan and scorecard to put the budget and requests for funding in the proper perspective.
The ad hoc Faculty Senate SLO committee presented their recommendations to the Faculty Senate on May 5th. One recommendation was to provide clearer guidelines on using SLOs and other assessment data in contract renewal and faculty evaluations. After the Faculty Senate Forum with John Morton and J. N. Musto, the guidelines were rewritten and it has passed.

Their second recommendation had two parts. One was to proceed with an Assessment Management System (AMS) as soon as possible. Some of the Community Colleges have their own systems such as Leeward CC uses TK20. It was proposed that the optimal situation is for the UHCC system to use a centralized system. The goal is to pilot a system in 2015 and fully implement by fall 2016. If not a system-wide AMS, Kapiolani CC will need to create a task force to choose a system that will fit the entire campus’ needs. A homegrown system is unadvisable, as sole responsibility of the software will fall on the creator. Ideally, the system will be connected to Banner to share data.

The second part of the recommendation is to establish a position for an assessment coordinator or director to coordinate the selection of an AMS and run the AMS for the campus. The Title III grant application will include a request for an AMS system and position. The faculty SLO coaches will still be needed to support the faculty. A suggestion as made to change the word “assessment” to “instructional improvement” to move away from thinking about assessment as a compliance issue and more about inquiry and learning.

There are new SLOs for the counselors. A crosswalk is being created to assist in the transition from the old to the new SLOs. One group of counselors is using a template that shows a full cycle of assessment. Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) are being developed for Admissions, Graduation and Registration. A survey was conducted for these areas and there were 240 responses. A graduates survey will be given before the commencement ceremony to determine what the students will be doing after graduation.

Feedback on Second Drafts of the Recommendation Responses

- One suggestion was to add the information from recommendation 3 to recommendation 2 to connect the SLO process to budget and planning such as the decisions made regarding teaching equivalencies.
- A general comment for the recommendations was to provide a glossary of all the acronyms.
- There is a list of programs but we need to tell the story behind each program and how the decisions were made and budgeted.
- Many institutional decisions are based on course level assessments not program level.
- The following is an example of the process of course assessment leading to program assessment leading to program improvements: Course assessment
data are used to feed program improvement. As an example, in Arts & Sciences, course assessment data from multiple disciplines are used to measure the impact and effectiveness of three initiatives, which span the academic disciplines. These three initiatives (Cornerstone, Service Learning, and Writing across the Curriculum) are assessed annually and the results of these assessments are aggregated and used to inform the Annual Report of Program Data for the Liberal Arts AA degree. In Fall 2012, the Celebration of Learning in Arts & Sciences was held to disseminate the results of the ARPD. At this event, faculty learned that students were meeting established benchmarks for four of the five Liberal Arts program SLOs and were falling short in the realm of Critical Thinking. From this, the Chancellor worked with the Dean of Arts & Sciences to identify undergraduate research as a campus priority, which would address Critical Thinking. The Chancellor declared 2014 as the Year of Undergraduate Research and dedicated funds to support this assessment-identified priority.

- A course grade is a measure of achievement, not a measure of learning.
- ACCJC and program accreditors require that some program and course data be accessible to the public. Many departments and programs store their data in password-protected Laulima sites, and much of this does not need to be open to the public. A subcommittee was formed to address the storing and access of data for internal use, accreditor information and public information. The discussion was tabled until the next meeting. The subcommittee members are Sunny, Tony Silva, Lisa Kanae and Ana Bravo.

Charter for the Accreditation and Assessment Work Group
This is not a disappearing work group. The current main focus is the ACCJC Follow-Up Report due October 2014. The committee will continue past that date to encourage others to participate in the process and to contribute more to the campus long term. The suggestion was made to include junior faculty members.

The next requirement is the Midterm Report due October 2015. It is a shorter version of the self-study showing the progress from 2012 and addressing the nine original recommendations. Accreditation is in a six-year cycle but consideration is being made to use a seven-year cycle for high performing colleges that show continuous instructional improvement.

The goal is to establish an infrastructure for assessment, which will streamline the accreditation process. A suggestion was made to have two-year terms for members.
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