

Title: Faculty Forum – Learning Assessments  
Place: Tamarind Room, `Ōhelo Building  
Date: Thursday, February 13, 2014  
Time: 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Attendance sheets are attached.

**Introduction: Susan Dik, Faculty Senate Chair**

Faculty Senate Chair Susan Dik introduced the people who were presenting: Bob Moeng, Laure Burke, Tony Silva, Dawn Zoni and Sunyeen Pai.

The purpose of the forum is to provide information on learning assessments but more importantly, to receive feedback on how to make the process easier and more effective.

Faculty have been working on SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) for eight years. The college has approved the use of the name “course competencies” instead of SLOs. The goal is the same: to assess student learning and to improve student success. The terminology and tools continue to improve and change. This is an effort to be transparent and look at the process analytically.

100% of the CLRs (Course Learning Reports) were received before accreditation, which was a major accomplishment. The next steps are to ask the questions: how do we access the data? What is it meant to do?

The cycle includes setting goals. This is where I want to be, here is how I measure it and, then, measure the results against the goal. If I didn’t reach the goal, this is what I plan to do. Then, reassess. We are in the next phase. We set the goals, now we’re asking, how did I meet the goal? What do we do next?

It is clear that the college’s accreditors are being persistent on SLOs. They are expecting the campus to be centered on student learning. Out of five recommendations, three are specifically focused on SLOs.

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Update: Sunyeen Pai, ALO (Accreditation Liaison Officer)**

The letter from the ACCJC has asked us to address five recommendations. All recommendations refer to SLOs with the purpose of assisting us to be the best college we can be. Decisions on improving our SLOs will affect resource allocation decisions. What is happening in your classes will make its way to the budget decisions made by the administration. The focus is on targeted communication, which cuts across silos. For instance, the college will be developing service outcomes as part of recommendation five, which cuts across several areas. The idea

is to have a common language for our assessments. We need to determine what we are looking for, what is needed and to create processes and ensure communication.

There was a clarification on the difference between student learning outcomes and student service outcomes. Service outcomes are closer to a satisfaction survey. It will include areas such as financial aid, CELTT, security, etc. These are areas where students are not gaining any knowledge. The data is to encourage productivity. These service outcomes will need to be established before October 15, 2014, the deadline for the follow-up report to the ACCJC. In addition, revised accreditation standards will be announced soon.

### **Faculty Senate SLO ad hoc Committee: Bob Moeng, Chair**

The SLO Assessment Committee is working to advance a culture of assessment on the campus. The faculty senate and SLO committee are instrumental in keeping assessment in the hands of the faculty. It is important to own it and be in control through an active process or it will be dictated to the faculty from others. It was a milestone to complete 100% of all CLR's last spring. However, this is not the end. We will have a continuing dialogue about the process and will go beyond collecting assessment data. There will be an analysis of the data and adjustments will be made to our courses. Did the adjustments make a difference? This cycle of assessment is important. Colleagues need to talk about the assessment results to continually work to improve the courses.

The SLO committee is developing methods by which faculty can assess. New faculty will need to be informed of the process. Timelines are being created for the assessment cycle and templates are being created online. Faculty development and coaching are being offered. If there is a question about assessment, ask your department chairs, committee representatives, Laure Burke and Tony Silva for assistance. In some cases, for example, with e-portfolios, seeking help from specific individuals may be recommended.

The UHCC system is in the process of converting Curriculum Central to the new Quali Student Curriculum Management (Quali SCM) system. We are seeking to include the learning outcomes assessments a way of getting them online. The current templates to complete the CLR's will continue to be used for the time being. Last spring, there was a rush to complete the CLR's at the last minute. The SLO committee is suggesting a method for scheduling. Every competency is required to be assessed and tracked every five years at the minimum. Courses assessments will be staggered. Faculty will be a need to commit to an assessment schedule with their department chairs to meet the 5-year minimum expectation. By combining curriculum and assessment management, in the form of Quali, the proposed assessment schedule will go through an approval process to make sure it meets the minimum requirement. Assessment reports, based on the current CLR form will be submitted online. The launch date for the site has not been determined. The SLO committee is requesting the ability to show the status of completed documents.

A suggestion was made to assess all competencies at the same time. It will be difficult to track all the courses if the deadlines are staggered and if all courses are assessed at the same time, courses in the same area can be compared for consistency throughout the curriculum. Many agreed that it would be better to do all competencies at the same time. At some point, there could be an alignment of the 5-year assessments and the 5-year review. It is also possible to do the course assessments more often. The idea of having staggered assessment reporting is to encourage faculty communication annually. A continuous cycle of dialogue is good for continuity. When did the first 5-year cycle begin? November 2009 was when the discussions started. However, Spring 2013 is when all the CLR's were completed. The cycle begins again when the first assessment is completed. Another suggestion was to assess the CLR's every 3 years to coincide with the Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPR's).

A full cycle includes assessment (measure and record data), evaluation and improvement. If money is needed to facilitate the improvements, then the budget should be allocated. Then, the cycle begins again. The next step is for budget considerations to be driven by the requests for funds to improve SLO's.

There was a discussion on the Lecture Evaluation Policy from the UHCC system. A resolution was passed in the faculty senate to assess the lecturers in the same way as the full time faculty. This makes it even more important to assess all the courses at the same time to see how the courses are connected. Laure Burke noted that looking at the assessments as an aggregate helps the faculty work collectively to improve their craft. It isn't intended to isolate the faculty member. If only one person teaches the course, it's more difficult to get a collective assessment. Lecturers need to be involved in making improvements as well.

The lecturer guidelines state, "...The lecturer position does not include curriculum development, development of student learning outcomes, college service, or other professional duties expected of faculty member." However, the lecturer can be asked to provide data for the course. How is the aggregated information used to evaluate an instructor since the CLR's are for courses? Faculty who teach in multi-section courses will have no individual course data.

### **Student Learning Assessment Support: Tony Silva, Laure Burke and Dawn Zoni**

Tony, Laure and Dawn are assessment coaches who support department chairs. They also serve on the faculty senate SLO committee. How do we best support faculty? The spring 2013 faculty survey gathered faculty concerns. There were three main areas of concern: reports, process and training. Documents have been improved. The course assessment plan was adjusted to bring it in line with the catalog. A cover page was added to the course learning reports. Results of the interventions from the previous cycle were noted. "LASR" was developed to maintain a schedule of the reports to determine which courses had been assessed.

Department chairs can scan the spreadsheet to track reports. SLO care packages and an open Laulima site were created. A course level assessment check list for the department chairs is being developed. Professional development opportunities are being provided. To address a request from the faculty survey, they started “SLO Fridays at Kap CC” with three themes: SLO skills, which provide helpful tools; SLO stories, which are examples of how data is used to improve learning; and SLO coaching to support faculty. These topics will continue this spring. The best way to support faculty was to point them to resources. They made a request to let them know if someone is doing good work in assessment and they will make it a “SLO stories” feature. The goal is to learn from each other.

Under “Assessment at Kap CC”, there are terminologies, a description of the cycle and information on the following:

1. Course assessment plan
2. Course learning report
3. Course schedule
4. ARPDs
5. Comprehensive program review

There was a story featuring the English faculty using portfolios. The faculty graded the same reports to agree on a standard for good writing and they used this information to alter their assignments. A question was asked on whether there were different SLOs for counselor vs. instructor SLOs. The counseling faculty are under a decentralized counseling system with no place for their SLO assessments to be reported. The Student Affairs Leadership Team (SALT) worked for about a year to create a coordinated student assessment model following the accreditation commission guidelines. This data is being used for resource allocation discussions. Ana Bravo, counseling assessment coordinator, is working with the counselors to report the assessments. Last fall, 18 counselors participated in a 2-day retreat at Windward Community College to create a common mission and common SLOs. They created 15 SLOs, which cover the whole student experience with common rubrics. The criteria for ACCJC are being met. How do we move forward? They will speak to the Deans and Chairs at the next VCAC meeting to be included in the dialogue. They are in a 3-year cycle to be in sync with the CPRs. Counselors, student affair staff and academic instructors could learn from each other and share the process.

How does the 3-year cycle fit in ACCJC recommendation 3? By fall 2013, each group had gone through the full cycle. Now, they are working with Brian Furuto on developing service outcomes (SOs) or service area outcomes (SAOs) to meet the requirements. All counseling units will have SLOs and some will have additional SAOs. All data will be collected by spring 2014.

**Faculty Senate Student Success Center Committee Update: Veronica Ogata, Chair**

The first step was to discover the needs of the students. A survey was sent to the students and they received 523 responses. The age range of the students was 18-65+. A recurring request was for tutoring in all subjects. Another request was to minimize running from department to department for information. They requested extending the hours of some service areas as many close at 4pm. Student center names were suggested. Students commented that they felt supported by the faculty. They requested faster access to technology on campus. The student success center committee felt there should be a student success CAMPUS. As soon as the student is on campus, every area at the college should support their success. It is not a physical space. Spaces like the Kopiko Learning Community, which is set up for collaborative learning and faculty interaction with students, are important as well.

Tutoring was a prominent request. There needs to be a commitment for a stable, sustainable tutor program. The committee visited success centers and in many programs, tutors were being funded by grants.

Susan Dik concluded the forum by thanking those who participated, emphasizing the importance of shared governance at the college and deferring the discussion of faculty evaluations to the next faculty forum.

Submitted by Joanne Whitaker