

Additional Attendees: Kevin Andreshak, Ana Bravo, Laure Burke, Susan Inouye, Bob Moeng, Amy Patz Yamashiro, Sally Pestana, Jia Qiong, Lori Sakaguchi, Anthony Silva, Louise Yamamoto (for Carol Hoshiko)

Introduction
A joint meeting of the full Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) and the CAC Accreditation and Assessment Work Group was convened to discuss and review the Assessment Management System (AMS) recommendation.

Assessment Management System (AMS) Recommendation: Laure Burke & Anthony Silva, SLO Assessment Coaches
Laure Burke began by describing the steps that led to the Assessment Management System (AMS) recommendation. Refer to the “Adoption of an Assessment Management System” document for details (Appendix A). In response to accreditation recommendations to improve the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment process, the College’s Faculty Senate identified its Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (FS SLO Committee) to address this. In May 2014, the FS SLO Committee submitted, and the Faculty Senate approved, a recommendation that an assessment management system be purchased and that a full-time coordinator be hired to manage it.

In a memo dated August 1, 2014, the Chancellor notified a core group (the outgoing and incoming Faculty Senate Chairs, the Chair and Co-Vice Chairs of the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, the College’s Accreditation Liaison Officers, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) that funds were allocated for the purchase, installation, training and use of an assessment management system contingent upon these funds being “spent and/or encumbered by September 15, 2014.” This group was assigned by the Chancellor to make a recommendation on the selection of an assessment management system. The recommendation would go to the full Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) and the CAC Accreditation and Assessment Work Group before being sent to the Chancellor. This group called a meeting of the AMS stakeholders to discuss how to implement the
Chancellor’s request and a plan was developed in order to proceed with the selection and procurement process.

With input from a group of assessment management system stakeholders, the search group developed a list of potential systems, gathered broader campus input on the criteria list by which the systems would be evaluated, provided the vendors with a list of needed functionality/criteria, and scheduled webinar presentations and a general debriefing session to take place across three days of the College’s fall 2014 duty week period in August.

After the webinars for each system had been presented, the debriefing session was held. Forty-three people were in attendance. To determine which functions of an assessment management system were deemed most important by the attendees, the facilitators led the group through a prioritizing exercise. The list of desired AMS functionality weighted by importance (from most to least) is as follows:

1. Integrates external sources of data (Kuali, Banner, Laulima, etc.)
2. Supports non-instructional assessment
3. User friendliness and training/tech support (tie)
4. Supports our campus’ assessment processes
5. Shows alignment of outcomes for all relevant levels of the institution
6. Allows communication between system and users
7. Integrates external standards (WASC, ACCJC, etc.) and includes both vendor-provided and customizable reporting (tie)
8. Pricing

The AMS search group began its deliberation on the weekend between duty week and the first day of instruction of fall 2014 by individually reviewing the evidence gathered during the search process:

- The functionality/criteria list compiled by the FS SLO Committee
- The video recordings of the webinars
- The functionality priority list created by attendees at the debriefing session
- The posters of the perceived strengths and weaknesses from the debriefing session
- The online functionality/criteria surveys completed by the vendors
- The online functionality/criteria surveys completed by the webinar attendees

The two vendors that rose to the top were Taskstream and LiveText. A second webinar was scheduled to give the group an opportunity to ask additional questions and review the Learning Achievement Tools (LAT) function. This function is similar to what LiveText is currently implementing for the Culinary Arts and possibly other CTE departments.

On August 26, the AMS search group made the decision to recommend Taskstream. Both Taskstream and LiveText will be able to integrate with Banner and Laulima; provide for single sign-on functionality; provide free online and video training; and both vendors host the system on their own servers, maintain the systems and provide free updates.

The system differs in important ways:
- Original purpose: “The assessment management system should aid users to view course and program assessment plans, chosen assessment methods, and the impact of proposed changes or adjustments. Ideally, assessment data are
presented in a way that encourages broad participation and meaningful
discussion at the course, program, and institutional levels."

- **Functional priorities:** Based on the responses by the vendors to the online
  survey, Taskstream best meets 3 of the 5 most important functionalities.
  Taskstream better integrates external data, supports non-instructional
  assessment and better supports the College’s current assessment processes
  such as the Course Assessment Plans (CAPs), Course Learning Reports (CLRs)
  and Learning Assessment Schedule and Reports (LASRs).
- **Assessment planning:** Taskstream has robust planning and reporting tools,
  including its curriculum planning map/matrix.
- **Campus assessment culture:** the Taskstream system is a better match for the
  College’s current culture surrounding assessment.
- **Connecting assessment to needed resources and budget:** Taskstream supports
  budget and resource request tracking and integration with assessment data,
  allowing users to see budget requests across the institution.
- **Service learning, field placement and internship data:** This functionality would
  help the college manage the data generated from these activities.

Additional functionality:
- Our nomenclature: supports the use of customized titles and terms
- Assessment review: provides feedback on the assessment process
- Customized accreditation-based reports: provides templates for accrediting
  agencies and can custom-build templates at no additional cost
- Management of strategic planning: allows for mapping of strategic plan goals and
  allows them to be aligned to assessment data
- In-class performance-based assessment: allows for “live” assessment of student
  performance in class, which can be used with an iPad or other tablet.
- Multiple evaluators: allows multiple evaluators to score a student assignment
- Blind evaluation of student work: allows replacement of student names with
  random identifiers for blind evaluations.

**Comments from the CAC, CAC Accreditation and Assessment Work Groups and
additional attendees:**
There was a question on the student subscription price for the E-portfolios. The E-
portfolios function is a learning tool to help students archive their work and allows for
authentic self-assessment. Privacy settings can be controlled and can be sent to
employers. Students can choose to discontinue the subscription and download their
work. The Learning Achievement Tool (LAT) is the Eportfolio function where rubrics can
be uploaded and used by faculty to grade and assess students.

The AMS will be a good accreditation tool as it will show that faculty are assessing
learning outcomes and analyzing them for continuous improvement. Faculty, department
chiefs, deans and vice chancellors will be able to access information on the status of
assessment for each course and program. Currently, faculty are filling out forms and
uploading the information to Laulima, which is difficult to access. This is an electronic
equivalent to the paper process.

A question was asked whether the search group reviewed references for the vendors.
Four references were received from Taskstream. One of two references was submitted
for LiveText. The AMS search group developed six questions and received informative
responses.
There was a comment that LiveText has an integrated AMS and LAT. There is no additional cost for the AMS. LiveText provides analytics but charges an additional fee for advanced analytics. Beyond the price, the focus was to seek the tool that works best for our needs.

One of the more compelling reasons for choosing Taskstream is that the non-instructional units will be able to use it, which will improve the culture of assessment across the campus. It will also automatically input the data from Laulima, facilitating easier implementation.

There was a question regarding more detailed functions for the E-portfolios. It was noted that there was not an opportunity to work with either system directly. However, from the presentations, the Taskstream E-portfolios allow a student to make several e-portfolios (for instance, student learning, nursing and general education) and place them on one dashboard. Integration with Laulima means that when a student uploads the document into Laulima, it can be directly imported into Taskstream. Learning assessments can be archived and used in programmatic assessments. LiveText will be offering that functionality but not until January 2015. New Media Arts majors can upload their videos. Taskstream provides unlimited data storage using streaming videos.

A question posed was whether a student’s work can be archived as evidence and mapped to institutional outcomes. As the outcomes are already linked, the evidence could be made available. Another function is a discussion feature. Lecturers would be able to have input on course assessments through the discussion board. All faculty will have access to the AMS.

A concern was whether students and faculty will use the system. What is the commitment to learning and education that the College is making? The College is committed to Student Learning Outcomes to improve student learning. The AMS will make the process easier and more efficient. The Culinary Arts department will be using LiveText this year. The department purchased the licenses for the students for the 2014-2015 academic year. Students may not utilize the program if faculty members are not committed to using it. A carefully planned roll out period is essential to the implementation of the AMS. Taskstream will support the College during the roll out.

For the LAT implementation, a limited number of licenses can be purchased and offered to faculty on an individual basis as a pilot. Therefore, the functionality between LiveText and Taskstream can be compared and analyzed at the end of spring 2015. There are two purchasing options: a charge of $30 for one-year access for 500 students or $40 for one-year access for 250 students. Any licenses not used can be rolled over to the next year. All faculty will be using the AMS. The Culinary Arts department noted that rubrics have been uploaded into Livetext. However, they can be easily exported to any system and the department is open to utilizing the best system for the College.

Another important part of the process is the hiring of an assessment coordinator to implement and maintain the assessment process. The position was added to the next Title III proposal. Maui Community College was first to purchase LiveText for their Culinary Arts program. A faculty member from Maui CC trained KapCC’s Culinary department. This was effective as the trainer was a person with knowledge of the discipline who worked one-on-one with the instructors. This made the transition for the faculty easier.
How do we create a spirit of assessment for the faculty instead of thinking of it as an accreditation requirement? During roll out and implementation, there will be efforts to communicate the reasons for assessment. Taskstream is knowledgeable about the organizational culture and good at working with the culture to make implementation as smooth as possible. It is not a new task for faculty. It is a software tool to house and organize the data. Faculty senate will be instrumental in promoting assessment as part of being a professional educator. The LAT will provide students will high quality and “live” information on how they are doing.

**Recommendation:**
Based on evidence available to the AMS search group, the group recommends that the College adopt the Taskstream Assessment Management System (AMS) and the Learning Achievement Tool (LAT) platforms for assessment data management and collection at the College.

There was a motion made, seconded and approved to end the discussion of the AMS and to vote for the recommendation.

There was a motion made and seconded to accept the recommendation that was submitted by the AMS search group.

By show of hands, twenty-eight voted yea, zero voted nay, three abstentions, and the vote was passed in favor of the recommendation.

CAC Accompanying Documents can be found on Quill
Go to (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/home), select the “Governance: Shared and Participatory” site (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/governance), click on the “Chancellor’s Advisory Council (CAC) formerly known as Policy, Planning and Assessment Council (PPAC)” link, log in to get to (http://quill.kcc.hawaii.edu/page/ppac.html).
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