

Kapi'olani Community College Assessment Strategic Plan

This report reviews the history of assessment at Kapi'olani Community College and maps future directions in assessment for the College.

2017

Preface

In February 2017 the Chancellor requested that Sally Pestana and Tanya Renner, assessment coordinators for the College in 2012 and 2013, research current college assessment activity and develop an assessment plan for future assessment at the College (see Appendix 1). The purpose of the plan is to address assessment practice for instruction, academic support, administrative services, and student affairs. Taking a comprehensive approach, they conducted a thorough review of current assessment practices and asked for input from the

- Taskstream Coordinator,
- General Education Board members,
- CTE Assessment Coach,
- Arts & Sciences Coach,
- Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcome Committee,
- Accreditation Liaison Officer,
- College Accreditation Consultant, and
- various other faculty and staff working on assessment

Revision date: March 13, 2017

DRAFT

Kapi'olani Community College

2017 Assessment Review

Historical Perspective of Assessment at Kapi'olani CC

Continuous, Revealing, & Changing

“Assessment is an integral part of institutional effectiveness. A systematic, ongoing cycle of setting goals, measuring attainment of those goals, and using the results to make informed decisions is crucial to continuous improvement. Good assessment can promote quality for all functions of the institution by providing necessary evidence to guide effective decision making in several areas including institutional changes, programmatic changes, and curricular modifications. Assessment is driven by faculty and staff, and it must be supported by the College through adequate resource allocation, transparency of decision-making and professional development opportunities, including systematic and frequent opportunities for widespread dialogue regarding the use of evidence to make improvements. Assessment results are intended for changes in courses, curricula, programs, and institutional structure and function, not the evaluation of individual faculty members.” (Adapted from the 2010 Kapi'olani Community College Course Level Assessment Plan).

It has been nearly a decade since Kapi'olani Community College Faculty Senate approved the **Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Framework (Adopted 11/5/07)**. The philosophy embraced in that document continues to guide the campus today, although we have made many improvements and adopted various strategies to implement it over time.

“Accreditation, by design, evaluates institutional quality which is determined by how well an institution fulfills its purpose (Beno, 2004). Producing learning is one of the core purposes of an institution of higher education, and as such, the student learning produced needs to be evaluated by the institution to assure all stakeholders that students achieve the intended learning outcomes that the college has set. Assessing student learning and attainment of intended student learning outcomes is a central process in evaluating institutional effectiveness.

Supporting students as they work towards attainment of the intended learning outcomes is the shared responsibility of all academic, academic support, and administrative units. As such, all employees on this campus are learning-facilitators who strive to remove barriers that impede student success and help students to navigate through the college as they pursue attainment of the intended student learning outcomes (O'Banion, 1997). To this end, all academic, academic support, and administrative units need to engage in an

assessment process that results in improved quality of services that directly or indirectly support teaching and learning.

The student learning outcomes assessment framework that follows addresses the idea that assessment is a transparent, clearly documented process that supports a culture of inquiry and leads to a stronger and more effective learning institution. The framework provides a format for faculty to discuss what the results of learning assessment mean, to identify ways of improving learning, and to implement strategies for improvement. The framework also provides a format for academic support, student services, and administrative units to assess their effectiveness, and to engage in a use of results discussion that leads to the improvement of services and the support of student learning.”
(Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Framework - Adopted 11/5/07)

University of Hawaii Board of Regent policy defines the role of Faculty Senates as ***“advising the administration on matters impacting and/or relating to the development and maintenance of academic policy and standards to the end that quality education is provided, preserved, and improved.”*** The Kapi’olani Community College Faculty Senate and administration have worked together in a close partnership to create a culture in which students, faculty, and administration understand and value learning assessment.

The **4-Step Assessment Cycle** from the 2007 document providing for a systematic approach to learning outcome assessment is likewise timely and appropriate a decade later and continues to guide our assessment activities.

1. Identify SLOs and Develop an Assessment Plan -- Document intended SLOs in syllabi, and curriculum documents for courses and programs.

- Assessment plan – faculty determine who will be assessed, when they will be assessed, what will be assessed, how they will be assessed, and how the data will be collected, stored and used.
- Develop benchmarks and rubrics that define the criteria for success for each SLO that the college has defined.
- Align courses and student learning outcomes at the general education and program level.

2. Gather Evidence - Data on student learning are collected and documented based upon the methods outlined in the assessment plan.

3. Interpret Evidence/Data Analysis – Faculty analyze the evidence and the results from assessment and have a collegial dialogue focused on what the results mean and what faculty and the institution can do to improve student learning. This step involves making summative judgments about student learning relative to the intended SLO. This analysis needs to be documented in an assessment report and made available to all stakeholders and accreditors. The report should also be used for strategic and tactical planning and program review.

4. Implement Change - Implement changes based on the dialogue. These changes can be tied to the outcome, the assessment methods, criteria for success, instructional methods, support structures, resources, and/or institutional policies that impede student success. Recommended changes should improve institutional quality. Changes should also be connected to tactical planning efforts so that resources can be allocated effectively to support student learning. The impact of the changes implemented in step 4 is then assessed in the next cycle of assessment.

In November 2010, the Faculty Senate adopted the **Course Level Assessment Plan (CLAP)** designed to address implementation of course SLOs assessment. The plan was updated in 2015, and formally approved by the Faculty Senate in February 2016.

“At the course level, assessment is a means to systematically examine the degree to which students attain the course competencies as evidenced through demonstrated student learning. Faculty collectively engage in a formal process of evaluating student performance on signature assignments, projects, embedded questions, and/or exams and then fine tuning some aspect of the course/curriculum, when applicable, with the ultimate purpose of improving overall educational quality and achieving improved student learning. Assessment results may suggest curriculum modifications, exploration of various pedagogical tasks, and/or adjustments to assessment practices; the end result is an iterative cycle of improvement.” (Course Level Assessment Plan (CLAP) 2010 & 2015)

That document defined the difference between grading and assessment:

Grading is an evaluation of individual student learning. Faculty assign grades, and students and faculty work together to identify the student’s own strengths and weaknesses. Final grades carry an aggregate assessment of a student’s entire work for the course.

Assessment looks at student learning across students, sections, and courses. Faculty must work collectively to identify where learning is satisfactory, which approaches produce the most learning, and what needs to be improved. Assessment is not focused on individual students, but rather on the aggregate. Faculty utilize various measures to determine the level of student achievement of course competencies. While assessment of student learning does not infringe on instructors’ grading procedures, instructors may well find that grading according to course competencies may contribute valuable information to the process of assessing course competencies.

The **Course Level Assessment Plan** provides four options for course SLOs assessment.

Option 1 - This option is applicable to courses in which faculty use different assignments and a common assessment rubric/set of criteria.

- ❖ Each instructor evaluates his/her students' work using agreed upon criteria (rubric). The assessments/assignments that are being scored are aligned with the specific course competencies that are being measured that year.
- ❖ Instructors summarize data and forward data to the program/discipline assessment coordinator. The program/discipline assessment coordinator aggregates the data.
- ❖ Instructors meet to discuss results and possible pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic revisions.
- ❖ The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator completes and submits a Course Learning Report (CLR) that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 2 - This option is applicable to courses in which faculty use different assignments and a common assessment rubric / set of criteria.

- ❖ Each instructor embeds a signature assignment or questions that are designed to measure specific competencies. Signature assignments or embedded questions are collected and scored by individual faculty using agreed upon criteria (rubric).
- ❖ Instructors forward scores to lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator. The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator aggregates the data.
- ❖ Instructors meet to discuss the results and possible pedagogical, curricular and programmatic revisions.
- ❖ The lead faculty or program/discipline coordinator completes and submits a Course Learning Report (CLR) that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 3 - This option is applicable to courses in which faculty use different assignments and a different assessment rubric/set of criteria.

- ❖ Each instructor summarizes his/her students' results on the target competency(s) being assessed, using his or her own criteria.
- ❖ Instructors meet to discuss the results and must determine commonalities and a reliable way to compare and contrast the information into a cohesive conclusion.
- ❖ Instructors meet to discuss possible pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic revisions based in the results.
- ❖ The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator completes and submits a Course Learning Report (CLR) that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 4 - This option is an add-on option; if used, it must be used in combination with Option 1, 2, or 3.

- ❖ Each instructor gives a student survey that has agreed upon questions (SALG or other survey can be used). Survey results should be aggregated.
- ❖ Instructors meet to discuss results
- ❖ Because surveys are indirect evidence of student learning, they can be used to validate the direct evidence collected in options 1, 2, and 3.
- ❖ The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator includes information from student surveys on the Course Learning Report (CLR).

DRAFT

Administrative, Student Service, and Support Units Assessment

Likewise, the **4-Step Assessment Plan** from the *2007 Assessment Framework* document for administrative, academic support, student services, and learning assistance units providing for a systematic approach to support outcome assessment is timely and appropriate a decade later. For clarity purposes, all outcomes by support units are now called support unit outcomes (SUOs), and no longer service outcomes.

1. Staff from administrative, academic support, student services, and learning assistance units identify service outcomes. The outcome statements must be clear and measurable, and must provide direction to the unit. Service outcomes relate to a unit's function within the larger context of the College's overall mission and goals. The purpose of the unit is made concrete and specific in the outcomes it identifies.
2. The outcomes are directly addressed by the methods and criteria designed to demonstrate achievement of those outcomes with benchmarks and criteria for success. The criteria identify the specific standards that will indicate successful achievement of the outcome.
3. Determine what data needs to be collected to assess the outcome. Unit can develop assessment instruments, use focus groups, and/or use productivity information. Determine a schedule for assessment.
4. The unit collects data and engages in a use of results discussion to determine the extent to which the service outcome has been met, and what actions need to be implemented in the future to improve the unit's effectiveness. The unit will share its findings in its program review. The results of the assessment process inform tactical planning and resource allocation, and become part of an institution wide discussion focused on how well the college achieves its mission and purpose. The unit will implement improvement strategies and assess their effectiveness in the next assessment cycle.

Faculty and staff use the following six-step assessment process for each SLO or SUO. (Adapted from the 2015 Course Level Assessment Plan)

1. Identify outcomes to be assessed
2. Determine the appropriate assessment tool.
3. Establish benchmarks
4. Analyze results: collect and record the aggregated results from the assessment. Analyze results to determine what is going well and what could be improved.
5. Make recommendations for improvement: use the results of the assessment to recommend improvements to curriculum, pedagogy, competencies, support, purchasing decisions, etc.
6. Implement recommendations and re-assess (i.e., close the loop)

Between 2010 and 2017, numerous changes in assessment implementation have been made, including:

- ✓ Updating the UHCCP#9.104 Lecturer Evaluation to include responsibility for responsibility by lecturers for learning outcomes assessment
- ✓ Converting the Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes ad hoc committee to a standing committee via a Faculty Senate constitution change
- ✓ Hiring a full time assessment coordinator
- ✓ Updating the college Strategic Plan
- ✓ Purchasing the commercial outcomes assessment management system, *Taskstream*
- ✓ Aligning resource allocation to outcomes assessment
- ✓ Creating a Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) assessment work group to monitor evaluation and improvement processes and procedures for course, program, general education and institutional student learning outcomes, encouraging dialogue on outcomes assessment and assessing the results and program reviews for all departments and units

Outcomes assessment is implicitly part of the college's mission statement:

"Committed to student success through engagement, learning, and achievement, we offer high quality certificates and associate degrees, and transfer pathways that prepare indigenous, local, national, and international students for their productive futures."

It is also implicitly part of the Kūlia value statement:

"Creating meaningful curricula and learning experiences that serve as a foundation for all to stand and move forward."

Outcomes assessment is explicitly part of the KCC 2015 -- 2021 Strategic Plan:

Strategic Direction IV: Modern Teaching and Learning Environments Ensure that students and faculty have the learning and teaching environments appropriate for the third decade of the 21st century and the sustainability practices to maintain those environments.

Outcome (P) Demonstrate improvement to programs and services through continuous, robust outcomes assessment.

These changes and others created the need for an update to the **2007 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Framework** and **2015 Course Level Assessment Plan** documents. And thus the following **2017 Recommendations and Assessment Strategic Plan** were created,

building on the work done by the college as noted in the 2007, 2010 and 2015 outcomes assessment documents.

DRAFT

2017 Assessment Recommendations

Assessment processes should not be modified to “get assessment done”.

Assessment processes should be updated to “get assessment used”!

Institutional values are communicated by what gets funded and rewarded.

Linda Suskie, 2017

1. A full time permanent position for a college Assessment Director (AD) needs to be established with program funding. There are widespread best practices supporting this recommendation. Such a position would send a clear message to faculty and staff that the college values assessment and recognizes the support faculty and staff needs to do assessment, analysis and evidence based decision making for changes based on that assessment. Such a position would create a sense of stability and accessibility for faculty and staff, and offer the level of professional expertise needed to adequately support all levels of assessment throughout the campus.

Responsibilities would include, but not be limited to:

- Review and provide feedback on course, program, institutional and support unit assessment plans, and reports.
- Facilitate implementation and monitor campus program and course level assessment plans and make recommendations for adjustments or modifications when necessary.
- Maintain campus course and program level assessment scorecard using Taskstream.
- Conduct assessment trainings for faculty and staff including the development of SLO/SUOs, methods for assessment, summarizing and analyzing data and making improvements with follow up closing the loop assessment.
- Assist faculty and staff with assessment tasks including developing tools, summarizing and analyzing data.
- Work with discipline Learning Effectiveness Research Advisors (LERAs) and CTE program directors on course level assessment.
- Work with support unit Support Effectiveness Research Advisors (SERAs) and on support unit level assessment.
- Advise faculty senate and administration on assessment issues.
- Assist accreditation liaison officer with assessment reporting.
- Coordinate all Taskstream activity.
- Serve as Taskstream Administrator.
- Create and monitor assessment reports via Taskstream.
- Develop and maintain a user-friendly public page on the College’s website where anyone can easily find and review the SLOs for each course, program, general education, and institution, the Support Unit Outcomes (SUOs), and the results of assessment for these outcomes.
- Chair the college Assessment Committee

- Oversee the creation of a link from each class section on the college Class Availability web page, to the syllabus for that section and ensure that the syllabus lists the current SLOs for that course. Until then, the housing of syllabi with corresponding listing of all course SLOs should continue to be maintained by the department chairs.
- Revive the Cornerstone Assessment Initiative in order to generate objective and direct learning outcomes data appropriate for assessment of AA degree and general education learning outcomes.
 - ❖ Facilitate development of cornerstone projects
 - ❖ Facilitate assessment of cornerstone projects
 - ❖ Collaborate with the General Education Board and AA degree program faculty in writing assessment reports for general education and AA SLOs.
 - ❖ Work with curriculum specialist to code cornerstone courses in Banner
- Write a “*Course Level SLO Assessment How To Handbook*” and “*SUO Assessment How To Handbook*” using the models of Saddleback Community College for inspiration. These handbooks would be helpful for all faculty and staff, new and experienced.

2. The current “coach” system is not adequate for the amount of support needed by individual faculty and staff to do the required assessment work. Replace the current “coach” system with Learning Effectiveness Research Advisors (LERAs) for Arts and Sciences discipline areas, create *Support Effectiveness Research Advisors (SERAs)* for support units, and enlist existing program directors (PD) for CTE programs. TE support and professional development for Learning Effectiveness Research Advisors (LERAs), Support Effectiveness Research Advisors (SERAs), and CTE program directors (PD) needs to be implemented so that all of those faculty and staff responsible for assessing outcomes will have access to ongoing support from their peers serving in these three roles. As accreditation and other reporting requirements become more sophisticated and demanding for assessment activity, the time demands on faculty and staff will increase accordingly. A minimum of three TEs per academic year for LERAs and PDs, and the appropriate workload modification for the SERAs is recommended. The individuals could choose how to use the 3 TEs over the two-semester academic year.

LERAs, SERAs and PD responsibilities would include, but not be limited to:

- Work with Assessment Director (AD) to support assessment activities in the department, discipline, and/or program
- Facilitate dialogue around assessment results for the purpose of making appropriate improvements
- Be a conduit of assessment information to the Assessment Director and OFIE
- Serve on the GE Board
- Ensure all course SLOs being taught at the College are assessed at least once every five years using student learning artifacts collected over several semesters
- Ensure assessment is documented in Taskstream
- Work with department chair and dean to incorporate assessment results into all other campus planning efforts
- Mentor new faculty around assessment
- Serve on the college Assessment Committee

3. To create a campus culture of value around assessment, establish a recognition and acknowledgement program. Suggestions include:

- establishment of an annual *Excellence in Assessment Award*, patterned after the *Excellence in Teaching Award*
- creation of a recognition system whereby all faculty and staff could earn the title of *Learning Effectiveness Research Scholar (LERS)* or *Support Effectiveness Research Scholar (SERS)* by conducting learning or support assessment in their respective classroom or support unit
- creation of an incentive reward system based on points earned for assessment work by LERS and SERS, with various awards earned at specified point “levels”, such as lunch with the Chancellor, reserved parking for a month, etc.
- make designated professional development funding contingent on having a LERS or SERS designation

4. Provide a variety of professional development opportunities around assessment.

- “*Morning (or Afternoon) of Excellence in Effectiveness*” – a two hour session before or after the opening Semester Convocation for campus wide dialog. Consider making participation mandatory. Sample topics for these sessions could include:
 - Best practices showcase of work completed
 - In depth dialog regarding assessment at both the intra-discipline and inter-discipline levels, across programs, and between faculty, staff, and administration
 - Training for faculty, staff and administration
 - Planning for evidence-based changes based on assessment data.
- Faculty workshops for both experienced and new faculty. Sample topics for these workshops could include:
 - Using transparent grading rubrics to generate authentic SLO data
 - Working with different courses within a discipline to look at developmental data for both course content and general education outcomes such as critical thinking
 - How to effectively communicate your assessment evidence to support a request for resources
 - Updating assessment rubrics

Professional development in assessment for new faculty and staff needs to be mandatory to ensure the college does not lose the progress achieved thus far. An introduction to assessment could be part of new faculty/staff orientation to “set the stage.” After that, each department or unit would be responsible to continue the orienting and mentoring via the LERAs, SERAs, CTE Program Directors, and unit heads.

5. Establish a college Assessment Committee for the purpose of systematically and thoroughly reviewing all campus assessment reports looking for patterns, trends, and successes and gaps. Committee members would be LERAs, SERAS, representative PDs, OFIE representative, and the AD. The Assessment Committee should report to the CAC assessment work group.

6. Clear direction needs to be given to the Assessment Director, LERAs, SERAs, department chairs, unit directors, Deans, and Vice Chancellors on their respective roles and responsibilities in the overall assessment structure.

7. Regular deadlines for completion and uploading of course and support unit assessment data into Tasksteam needs to be established similar to the model followed for Contract Renewal and Tenure & Promotion applications.

8. A clear, consistent practice needs to be followed by all departments using lecturers based on UHCCP #9.104 policy regarding the role and responsibilities of lecturers in learning assessment.

9. Adopt the ACCJC terminology of outcomes, rather than competencies, for all areas – course, program, general education, institutional, and support units. The college pushed the envelope with ACCJC during the last cycle by using the term competency rather than outcome. Competencies are different than outcomes. Faculty and staff need to have a clear understanding on the difference, with the knowledge that outcomes must be assessed and reported, while competencies may be assessed, but are not mandated to be reported. This may be presented as an opportunity to bundle competencies into fewer SLOs. This clear understanding will result in a much more manageable number of outcomes for the college, lessening the workload for many faculty and staff related to assessment.

10. Campus-wide, all outcomes should be called Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or Support Unit Outcomes (SUOs). Having one set of names will help with consistency, clarity, and communication. We anticipate that many of the outcomes relevant to support units will not be direct evidence of students learning and these would be called SUOs. Some support units may also utilize SLOs. We are recommending "support" rather than "service" as "support" applies universally.

Put a priority on assisting all support units (potential examples include Pathways Programs, Student Life, KISC, Community Relations, Business Office, HR Office, Aux Services, Security Services, Facilities Management, Testing Center, VA Center, Job Prep Center, and others) to translate Support Unit Outcomes (and SLOs, as appropriate) and their assessment methods into a common language and format for reporting in order to document how they are conducting SUO assessment as required by ACCJC.

11. Adopt the course five year review cycle as the five year assessment cycle for each course, thus resulting in a rolling assessment cycle customized to each course rather than the "set" current practice.

12. Reaffirm with all faculty the college's current "*Course Level Assessment Plan*" (CLAP) that mandates all course SLOs be assessed during the five year assessment cycle.

13. Update the 2015 "*Course Level Assessment Plan*" (CLAP) to reflect current practices.

14. Complete the update of the college's general education learning outcomes and the implementation of the institutional learning outcomes. Establish a clear policy showing which students are included in the assessment of general education and institutional learning outcomes. Determine how students who are expected to have achieved the general education learning outcomes will be identified. Determine which assessments will include CTE, certificate and non-credit students.

15. Establish a SUO Committee that reports to Staff Council, replicating the setup and work of the SLO Committee that reports to Faculty Senate.

DRAFT

Assessment Recommendations Implementation Timeline

Step	Start	Complete
Create position description for assessment director (AD)	Spring 2017	Spring 2017
Hire an AD into a fulltime permanent position	Spring 2017	Summer 2017
Establish responsibilities for Learning and Support Effectiveness Research Advisors (LERAs and SERAs), department chairs, deans, unit directors, and vice chancellors regarding roles in the overall assessment structure	Spring 2017	Summer 2017
Designate LERAs and SERAs for AY 17-18	Spring 2017	Summer 2017
Complete the update of the general education learning outcomes	Spring 2017	Fall 2017
Adopt the ACCJC terminology of outcomes rather than competencies; assist faculty in bundling competencies into outcomes	Spring 2017	Fall 2017
Convert all assessment efforts to common terminology: either student learning outcome (SLO) or support unit outcome (SUO)	Spring 2017	Fall 2017
Create SUOs (and SLOs, as appropriate) for all support units	Summer 2017	Fall 2017
Adopt the five year curriculum review cycle as the five year assessment cycle for each course	Spring 2017	Spring 2017
Reaffirm with all faculty the college's current "Course Level Assessment Plan" (CLAP) that mandates all course SLOs be assessed during the five year assessment cycle.	Spring 2017	Spring 2017
Assess general education learning outcomes in Spring 2017 using SALG	Spring 2017	Ongoing
Complete uploading of all AY 2016-2017 course and support unit assessment outcomes and assessment data into Taskstream.	Spring 2017	Fall 2017
Establish regular deadlines for completion and uploading of course and support unit assessment data into Taskstream similar to the model followed for contract renewal and tenure and promotion guidelines	Summer 2017	Fall 2017
Establish Learning Effectiveness Research Scholar/Support Effectiveness Research Scholar (LERS/SERS) title and award program	Summer 2017	Fall 2017
Develop and maintain a user-friendly public page on the College's website where anyone can easily find and review the SLOs for each course, program, general education, and institution, the Support Unit Outcomes (SUOs), and the results of assessments of these outcomes	Summer 2017	Ongoing

Step	Start	Complete
Establish a SUO Committee that reports to Staff Council, replicating the setup and work of the SLO Committee that reports to Faculty Senate	Summer 2017	Fall 2017
Orient LERAs & SERAs (two year term)	Fall 2017	Ongoing
Establish a college-wide Assessment Committee to review all campus assessment reports; membership includes LERAs, SERAs, PDs, OFIE rep, AD	Fall 2017	Fall 2017
Establish a two hour session scheduled regularly around Fall and Spring Convocations that provides for serious campus wide dialog around assessment	August 2017	Ongoing
Update the 2015 <i>"Course Level Assessment Plan"</i> (CLAP) to reflect current practices.	Fall 2017	Fall 2017
Provide systematic series of campus professional development workshops designed to support LERS/SERS activities	Fall 2017	Ongoing
Revive the Cornerstone Assessment Initiative in order to generate objective and direct learning outcomes data appropriate for assessment of AA degree and general education learning outcomes.	Fall 2017	Ongoing
Write a Course Level SLO Assessment How to Handbook and a SUO Assessment How to Handbook	Fall 2017	Fall 2017
Incorporate an assessment module within new faculty/staff orientation	Fall 2017	Ongoing
Development assessment plan for the updated general education learning outcomes	Fall 2017	Fall 2017
Development assessment plan for institutional learning outcomes	Fall 2017	Fall 2017
Provide education for all Department Chairs on UHCCP#9.104 policy to ensure consistent expectations regarding roles and responsibilities of lecturers in learning assessment	Fall 2017	Ongoing
Establish the criteria and selection process for an "Excellence in Assessment Award"	Fall 2017	Fall 2017
Develop and implement assessment plans for all SUOs	Fall 2017	Fall 2017
Implement assessment plan for updated general education learning outcomes	Spring 2018	Ongoing
Implement assessment plan for institutional learning outcomes	Spring 2018	Ongoing
Make designated professional development funding contingent on having a LERS or SERs designation	Spring 2018	Ongoing
Create a link from each class section on the Class	Spring 2018	Ongoing

Availability website to the syllabus for that section		
Implement the “Excellence in Assessment Award” selection plan	Spring 2018	Ongoing

DRAFT

2017 Assessment Strategic Plan

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Management

I. Identification, Review & Publishing

SLO MANAGEMENT	Course SLO s	Program SLOs	General Education SLOs	Institutional SLOs
RESPONSIBLE PARTY for identification and review	Faculty with support from LERA	A&S faculty, LERA, DCs & CTE PDs	General Education Board with support from LERAs, OFIE analysts, and Assessment Director	General Education Board with support from LERAs, OFIE analysts, and Assessment Director
REVIEW SCHEDULE	In sync with 5 year course update	In sync with five year CPR or sooner with program changes	Every five years	Every five years
DOCUMENTATION HOME	Course Outline of Record in Quali Taskstream Catalog Course Syllabi SLO Web Page	Taskstream ARPDs CPRs Catalog Course Syllabi SLO Web Page	Taskstream ARPDs CPRs Catalog Course Syllabi SLO Web Page	Taskstream ARPDs CPRs Catalog Course Syllabi SLO Web Page
RESPONSIBLE PARTY for internal and external dissemination	Course Outline of Record in Quali -- Faculty Taskstream – TS Coordinator Catalog – Catalog master Course Syllabi –Faculty SLO Web Page – AD	Course Outline of Record in Quali -- Faculty Taskstream – TS Coordinator Catalog – Catalog master Course Syllabi –Faculty SLO Web Page – AD	Course Outline of Record in Quali -- Faculty Taskstream – TS Coordinator Catalog – Catalog master Course Syllabi –Faculty SLO Web Page – AD	Course Outline of Record in Quali -- Faculty Taskstream – TS Coordinator Catalog – Catalog master Course Syllabi –Faculty SLO Web Page – AD
OVERSIGHT	LERA, DC and Curriculum Committee	DCs and Deans	VCAA AD	VCAA AD

Legend: DC- Department Chair, LERA – Learning Effectiveness Research Advisor, AD – Assessment Director, VCAA – Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, CTE PD – Career and Technical Education Program Director

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Assessment Management

II. Assessment, Analysis, Closing the Loop Actions & Results

SLO ASSESSMENT	Course SLO s	Program SLOs	General Education SLOs	Institutional SLOs
RESPONSIBLE PARTY for assessment, analysis, and closing the loop actions and result assessment	Faculty with support from LERA & CTE PDs AD	LERAs & CTE PDs AD	General Education Board with support from LERAs, OFIE analysts, and AD	General Education Board with support from LERAs, CTE PDs, OFIE analysts, and AD
ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE	In sync with 5 year course update	In sync with five year CPR	Two GE SLOs each year	Annually
DOCUMENTATION HOME for assessment data, analysis reports, and closing the loop actions and results	Taskstream	Taskstream ARPDs CPRs SLO Web Page	Taskstream ARPDs CPRs SLO Web Page	Taskstream ARPDs CPRs SLO Web Page
RESPONSIBLE PARTY for annual internal and external dissemination on SLO Web Page	AD	AD	AD	AD
OVERSIGHT	AD	DCs Deans AD	AS Dean VCAA AD	AS & CTE Deans CAA AD

Legend: DC- Department Chair, LERA – Learning Effectiveness Research Advisor, AD – Assessment Director, VCAA – Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, CTE PD – Career and Technical Education Program Director

Support Unit Outcomes (SUOs) Assessment Management

Identification, Review, Publishing, Assessment, Analysis, Closing the Loop Actions & Results

SUO MANAGEMENT	SUOs (and SLOs, as appropriate)
RESPONSIBLE PARTY for identification, review, assessment, analysis, closing the loop actions, and result assessment	SU staff with support from AD and SERAs
REVIEW & ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE	Annually
DOCUMENTATION HOME	Taskstream Annual report CPR SUO Web Page
RESPONSIBLE PARTY for internal and external dissemination	SERA UH AD Appropriate VC
OVERSIGHT	Appropriate VC AD

Legend: SERA – Support Effectiveness Research Advisor, SU – Support Unit, AD – Assessment Director, UH – Unit Head, VC – Vice Chancellor

APPENDIX 1



January 18, 2017

To: Chancellor's Advisory Council

Subject: Assessment Plan

There are many individuals and groups across the campus committed to substantive outcomes assessments. In Academic Affairs, Amy Patz Yamashiro has been asked to serve as the Interim Taskstream Coordinator, assisted by the SLO coaches, Tony Silva and Susan Jaworowski, to upload all courses into Taskstream with assessment plans. In addition, the SLO coaches have been engaging faculty in outcomes assessments, offering SLO Fridays and SLO stories for the past two years.

A General Education Board has been adopted under Faculty Senate to address course diversification and General Education Outcomes, led by Kealalōkahi Losch. Student learning outcomes are also being addressed in the Faculty Senate SLO committee led by Chair Amy Yamashiro.

In Student Affairs, the SLO Coaches No'eau Keopuhiwa and Ana Bravo convene workshops and retreats for counselors and work with areas such as KISC on their service area outcomes.

Institutionally, two Chancellor Advisory Council (CAC) Work Groups will be established at the end of January. The CAC Accreditation Work Group will be monitoring the progress on the 2018 ACCJC Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the CAC Assessment Work Group will be overseeing outcomes assessment and program reviews in all areas of the College including Administrative Services.

To provide clarity and direction to these multiple assessment areas, I've asked Sally Pestana, Chair, and Tanya Renner (representing Arts and Sciences) to draft a 3-5 year comprehensive Institutional Assessment Plan to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office in 4-6 weeks after the dissemination of this memo. Professional development funds will be provided for the Sally, Tanya and Laure for their efforts. This team will not be responsible for implementation of the Plan. We all will.

After the Assessment Plan is submitted to the Chancellor's Office, the Plan will be distributed to the stakeholders listed above for feedback before being adopted officially by the Chancellor's Advisory Council at the May 2, 2017, meeting.

Please support this ad hoc team by welcoming them to your meetings and providing relevant information.

Louise Pagotto

Interim Chancellor