CAC Accreditation and Assessment Workgroup Meeting
October 13, 2015

Meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm by Katrina Ghazanfar

Participants: Katrina Ghazanfar, Lori Sakaguchi, Susan Kazama, Louise Pagotto, No’eau Keōpūhiwa, Dawne Bost, Joanne Whitaker, Anthony Silva, Ron Takahashi, Sunny Pai, Bob Moeng and Salvatore Lanzilotti

1. CLR update:

No’eau reported on student services SLOs. Almost all counselors have been trained in Taskstream. No’eau is working with Cathy & Honda International Center to input SLOs into the system. They should be done by spring. Individual counselors have different timeframes for assessing their SLOs. It is a 3-year cycle, so at the end of 3-years all SLOs will have been assessed.

CTE and Maida Kamber counselors produce Counseling Learning Assessment Reports and they are submitting them to department chairs. Department ARPDs refer to these reports by including a link to their respective CLRs, pointing to http://ofie.kapiolani.hawaii.edu/program-review/ and listed under the heading Counseling Learning Assessments.

The number of department counselors are: Culinary-1, Hopsitality-1, Nursing-2, BLT-2, Health Sciences - 2, Maida Kamber 7-8.

Tony Silva reported on instructional assessment. Course level assessment started in 2011. OFIE’s goal was to assess all competencies in all courses within a 5-year cycle, meaning that all competencies should have been assessed at least once by spring 2016.

Each course has its own five-year cycle. At the end of AY 2015 all courses must be assessed. They will be meeting with the strategic planning team to ensure no SLOs are missed in this effort to complete assessment of all SLOs.

Instructors submit their CLRs to department chairs, who load them into departmental Laulima sites. The chairs then update the Learning Assessment Schedule and Report, or LASRs. These CLRs are turned over to OFIE. There is no accounting of document workflow during the process, so it is difficult to keep track of whether or not all SLOs are being assessed. Currently chairs are being given thumb drives and couriers deliver drives to OFIE.

It appears summer deadlines for CLR submissions were not completely met.

There may be some reluctance among faculty to go forward with SLO assessment when ACCJC ties assessment with faculty evaluation. UHPA and Administration are behind this concept. A Faculty Senate survey in 2013 regarding SLO assessment revealed concerns about the work time required for assessment and concerns about using assessment for the evaluation of faculty performance. The data flow is not easy, so SLO assessment drops off as it is not an immediate emergency, as it was in 2012 and 2014.
Louise felt that faculty enjoy assessment of learning, but find the administrative and data work difficult and less interesting. She wondered if support for data entry and other “administrative work” would help. Bob Moeng reminded the committee that the power of Taskstream is that it archives what one has done in the past and adds to the conversation about learning so that one can think about implications and trends.

Timeline for full implementation of AMS is Fall 2016. We have only one more year to work with the manual SLO assessment process.

Taskstream update by Dawne Bost:

Culinary is well on its way to using LAT. For Dental Assisting, all standards are almost loaded. There has been some interest in using the Taskstream AMS. Lisa Kobuke from the Freeman Program is now using the LAT.

The Taskstream Professional Development C4ward met last Friday.

The Taskstream Implementation Group (TIG) is considering developing more user training to help new users with learning the system. TIG is creating breakout groups to help move adoption along. Groups can focus on the LAT, professional development, and other key work areas. It is still a goal for the group to “disappear”, or eventually become unnecessary once adoption is more widespread. They are trying to understand how to incentivize people to use Taskstream. Louise established a Google Doc Forum inviting department chairs to get their departments more involved with Taskstream implementation.

Dawne reported that there are some issues with report capabilities. Decisions made early on with the configuration of the system are making it unnecessarily difficult to easily produce certain reports. She is working with Taskstream support specialists and other assessment colleagues to investigate these challenges. All the reports required by the implementation group can be produced; it just takes additional steps and work-arounds.

The field “Next Steps” can provide information about faculty goals. The data is in Taskstream but cannot be co-reported with performance data in an automatic fashion. There are also limitations in the reporting capabilities of the system due to the disabling of the Review Reports component.

Sunny did a five-minute quick briefing of how archiving for the 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 reports to ACCJC were done.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:05pm