California State University Channel Islands
ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

Meeting Notes
16 September 2010

Members Present: Caroline Doll, Steve Lefevre, Nelle Moffett, George Morten, Ed Nuhfer, Diana Smith, Judy Swanson. *Others Present:* Tia Clarke

Welcome

Nelle welcomed the group and led a brief review of the Policy on Assessment, the Policy on Review of Divisional Assessment Plans and an excerpt from the Seven Year Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (Dec. 2006). Nelle summarized the mission as, "the Assessment Council is responsible for assessing the assessment system and providing recommendations to the President." Discussion followed regarding the scope of this group:

1. Several members of the AC are responsible for assessment within their divisions
2. Need to keep track of which level of responsibility we are addressing in different conversations: institutional assessment system versus divisional assessment processes
3. AC responsibility operates primarily at a "meta" system level rather than at a divisional level although different conversations may address either level
4. We need to be clear which level we are addressing within a specific conversation

Accomplishments, Concerns, Desired Future

Members present discussed Assessment Council accomplishments, concerns, where we would be in 5 years if no changes are made to current practices, and desired future for the group and campus.

1. Completing the Past

Accomplishments	Concerns
Rubric	5 Year Cycle dissipates energy
Policy on Surveys	Need to coordinate divisional efforts into unified effort
Policy on Research Clearinghouse	Need to align w/ WASC Standards
Review of Student Affairs	Prioritizing what is doable and specific into a plan to accomplish this year and long term
	Need a common language for assessment
	Amount of work required in Student Affairs review was not sustainable
	Slow progress in developing assessment system and system review process. Need follow-through with energy
	Create process guided by purpose
	What does Council expect to see? (Rubric; reports)
	Division plans for moving divisions to a higher standard. Where is division now? Where will it be in 5 years?

2. Default future in five years if AC continues as it has in the past

DEFAULT FUTURE 5 YEARS
Report in meetings on division activities
Identify one division per year to do assessment
All divisions will have completed one assessment at the end of five years
Unclear whether divisions will have moved forward with their assessment processes
Little or no capacity building will have been accomplished
We will have a system of reporting for compliance purposes
Questionable whether WASC review will be successful

3. Desired future in five years. Where do we want to be in five years? What actions will the Assessment Council need to take in order to achieve this desired future?

DESIRED FUTURE VISION	ACTIONS TO CREATE VISION
University embraces a culture of evidence	Develop a common assessment language
Transparency with stakeholders	Create a tone of wanting people to succeed
We will have evidence of continuous improvements	Design training to meet the needs of each division
Will have vibrant, clear, doable processes for university-wide assessment	Hold regular debriefing sessions to identify lessons-learned
We will be prepared for successful WASC – ER	Analyze cost/benefit of value received for labor of assessment
Clear how university mission penetrates all units - how all units support mission	Share in-house expertise in aspects of assessment
	Develop a clear process at Assessment Council level
	Identify resources needed
	Develop marketing message and communication strategy that makes the assessment process meaningful
	Create an archive of what has been learned from assessing outcomes
	Close the feedback loop with emphasis on discovery

Next Steps

Draft a plan of action for the Assessment Council before the start of the spring semester. Nelle distributed a draft document of Inventory Questions for members to review, discuss, and revise at the next meeting. <Document attached below.>

DRAFT Document for Review Only

Inventory Questions	Yes	Some	No	Comments
1. Has the Division published an assessment plan that defines the assessment process: who, what, how, when, and reported to whom?				Name, revision date, and location of documents where published
2. Has the Division defined and published its goals?				Name, revision date, and location of documents where published
3. Has the Division defined the methods it will use to measure accomplishment of these goals?				Name, revision date, and location of documents where published
4. Are these measures applied to all appropriate levels (e.g. course, program, unit, area, institution).				Specify which levels
5. Does the Division routinely collect data on these measures?				Specify timeline, measures, and levels
6. Does the Division analyze the data to draw conclusions about accomplishments and areas for improvement?				Summarize, who, when, and documentation sources
7. Does the Division use the results of this analysis to make changes?				Summarize, who, when, what changes, and documentation sources
8. Does the Division do a follow-up study of changes made to determine if the changes had the intended impact?				Summarize, who, when, what changes, and documentation sources
9. Does the published plan accurately describe the assessment process that is used?				Summarize the nature of the differences between the documentation and actual practice

California State University Channel Islands
ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

Meeting Notes
30 September 2010

Members Present: Harley Baker, Caroline Doll, Steve Lefevre, Nelle Moffett, George Morten, Ed Nuhfer, Diana Smith, Judy Swanson. *Others Present:* Tia Clarke

Welcome new members

Nelle welcomed Harley Baker to the group and mentioned that a second faculty member, Marie Francois, and a student have also recently been appointed.

Review of Draft Inventory

A review of the draft Inventory Questions document commenced.

In an effort to define what is meant by terms such as "goals", it was suggested they may be viewed in two ways, likely with some overlap:

Strategic Planning	Assessment Plan
Operational Planning	Quality Improvement Process
Annual Report	Program Review
Accomplishments	
Did we do what we said we would do?	How well are we doing?
How well?	Is a division annual report "assessment"?

Or perhaps it is more cyclical, for example:

Mission
Doing
Planning
Doing
Assessment

Attempting to gain consensus on the questions to be included, there was discussion regarding the value of stating a common focus, language and purpose vs. autonomous units where interpretation is left to each unit.

Next Steps

Nelle has requested the committee members review the current document and forward her a brief statement of perceived purpose for the draft inventory document as well as any suggested revisions by next Thursday, October 7th.

Inventory Questions	Yes	Some	No	Comments
1. Has the Division published an assessment plan that defines the assessment process: who, what, how, when, and reported to whom?				Name, revision date, and location of documents where published
2. Has the Division defined and published its goals?				Name, revision date, and location of documents where published
3. Has the Division defined the methods it will use to measure accomplishment of these goals?				Name, revision date, and location of documents where published
4. Are these measures applied to all appropriate levels (e.g. course, program, unit, area, institution).				Specify which levels
5. Does the Division routinely collect data on these measures?				Specify timeline, measures, and levels
6. Does the Division analyze the data to draw conclusions about accomplishments and areas for improvement?				Summarize, who, when, and documentation sources
7. Does the Division use the results of this analysis to make changes?				Summarize, who, when, what changes, and documentation sources
8. Does the Division do a follow-up study of changes made to determine if the changes had the intended impact?				Summarize, who, when, what changes, and documentation sources
9. Does the published plan accurately describe the assessment process that is used?				Summarize the nature of the differences between the documentation and actual practice

California State University Channel Islands
ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

Meeting Notes
14 October 2010

Members Present: Caroline Doll, Nelle Moffett, George Morten, Ed Nuhfer, Diana Smith, Judy Swanson. *Others Present:* Tia Clarke

Review Inventory

Nelle thanked the council for their feedback on the draft Inventory and led a discussion on the newly revised document. The document was approved with a few minor changes. Nelle also gained consensus on the general direction of the council:

- Survey divisions regarding existing assessment practices and artifacts
- Evaluate division submissions
- Make recommendations to the President

Discuss Evaluation Rubric

Regarding evaluation of the information from the divisions, Nelle asked if we should forward the questionnaire along with the inventory and request a self-evaluation from each division or should the council conduct the evaluation using the documents provided by each division. It was agreed that the inventory questionnaire should be sent out now while we continue to work on the evaluation questions.

Members reviewed the existing rubric (created by the Assessment Council in 2008) and discussed how we might draft an evaluation survey using the basic structure and column labels of the rubric. There was consensus that the themes in the far left column need to be restated in simple questions. In preparation for the next meeting, members were asked to draft a few potential questions for the evaluation survey, especially questions that would pertain to their division.

It was noted that a self-evaluation completed by each division may be beneficial to the council by saving time and resources, however it also requires that we rely on the division representative to be fully objective and knowledgeable in reviewing their own documents.

This prompted further conversation regarding the Assessment Council's purpose. Nelle posed two questions in an effort to determine the focus of the council:

a) Is the division meeting their goals/purpose?

and/or

b) Does the division's assessment process work?

After some discussion, it was determined that the first question evaluates the outcome measures and ultimately this should reside at the division level while the second question evaluates the system/process and this should be the council's area of focus.

Process for Vetting Documents
A decision was made to forward the Inventory Questions document to each division for action while the council continues work on the rubric. Nelle will investigate the appropriate distribution for the document.

Next Steps
Nelle has asked council members to send her a few draft questions for potential addition to the rubric for discussion at the next meeting.