

To: Momi Kamahele, Chair, Faculty Senate

From: Jeff Judd, Chair, Program Review, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee

Re: Program Review, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee Annual Report, 2015-2016

Date: May 4, 2016

---

This is the Annual Report Summary of the Program Review, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee. The following are the three major activities of the 2015-2016 academic year and are presented as:

Report #1: Approved Changes to Program Review, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee (Jeff Judd)

Report #2: Progress Report of AA Degree Program Review, Eval, and Assessment Committee (Eunice Brekke)

---

**Report #1: Approved Changes to Program Review, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee:**

In spring 2015, an Ad Hoc Assessment proposed changes to the existing Program Review, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee's functions and membership (see previous annual report for 2014-2015). In spring 2016, the Faculty Senate approved those changes as part of its effort to revise and update the existing By-Laws and Charter. Below are the changes that were approved.

Item Change	Current	Proposed Change(s)	Rationale for Change(s)
Committee Name	Program Review, Institutional Research, and Assessment Committee	Assessment Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Better to reformat existing committee instead of creating an entirely new standing committee with similar functions.</li><li>2. "Assessment" is an all-encompassing term that includes IR and Program Review.</li><li>3. Current name is too bulky.</li></ol>
Committee Functions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Maintain a continuing overview of the instructional program for quality and content.</li><li>2. Monitor, evaluate, and recommend policies and procedures relating to program reviews.</li><li>3. Review program reviews and recommend their acceptance, revision, or rejection.</li><li>4. Make recommendations concerning academic and related programs and activities</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Review and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on policies and procedures relating to assessment.</li><li>2. Work with the Administration and Office of Planning, Policy &amp; Assessment to facilitate the assessment process and establish a culture of assessment.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Assessment Committee should be advisory rather than evaluative. Thus, the Assessment Committee's main function is to advise and assist campus-wide assessment efforts rather than serve as a "gate" for assessment quality control.</li><li>2. Assessment Committee's scope should include program review, but the initial focus should be on course and support area outcomes to make assessment more meaningful and connected to student learning.</li></ol>

	<p>undertaken outside the traditional framework of classroom activity.</p> <p>5. Review and evaluate the programs and activities conducted in this manner.</p>		
Committee Membership	<p>1. The Committee Chair and appointed faculty members shall be voting members.</p> <p>2. The Dean of Arts and Sciences or designated representative shall be invited to serve as a non-voting member.</p> <p>3. The Committee Chair shall coordinate with the Director of the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development as appropriate.</p>	<p>1. Membership includes appointed faculty members who shall be voting members.</p> <p>2. A member or designated representative of Administration or Office of Planning, Policy &amp; Assessment shall be invited to serve as a non-voting member.</p>	<p>1. Assessment Committee governance structure should consist of a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary.</p> <p>2. The Assessment Committee Chair may receive a 3-credit release time depending on the work load needed for the year.</p> <p>3. Assessment Committee should include support area units (where appropriate). Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the Unit Deans determine representation and that each area should be represented by 2-3 members.</p>

Currently, approval from campus faculty is being sought as part of the larger revisions to Faculty Senate By-Laws and Charter. However, to implement the new changes for the upcoming academic year 2016-2017, the Assessment Committee (as it is now known) began seeking representatives for its membership in spring 2016. As of this writing, the following faculty and staff have joined the committee:

Instructional (James Goodman, Ron Umehira)	Representative	Student Services (Curtis Washburn)	Representative	Academic Services (Paul Kuehn)	Representative
A & H	Jay Sakashita	Counseling	Jan Shimabukuro	EMC	Greg Walker
LA	No Representatives	A & R	Grant Helgeson	LRC	Beth Kupper-Herr, Laurie Kuribayashi
M&S	Andrea Wichman Jennifer McFatrige, Alex Ramos	Job Prep	Sandy Hoshino	Library	Leah Gazan, Natalie Wahl
SS	Jeff Judd	Student Life	Lexer Chou	Innovation Center for Teaching and	Cindy Martin

				Learning	
Inter Prog	Steve Jacques	Fin Aid	Gregg Yoshimura	Theatre	Kemuel DeMoville
Business	Doug Choy	Health Center	Sharon Hiu (pending)	Administrative Services (Mark Lane)	Representative
PAT	Milton Ayakawa	Rec/Gear Up	Allan Nebrija (pending)	Business Office	Cecilia Lucas
LCCW	Genai Keliikuli	Stud Services	Kami Kato	Human Resources	Lori Lei Hayashi
OCEWD	Patrick Leddy			Operations & Maintenance	Grant Okamura
Distance Education	Greg Walker			Enterprise Operations	William Akama
NH Student Support	Aulii Silva			Campus Security	Talbort Hook
Curriculum Committee	William Albritton, Peterson Gross			OPPA	Guy Nishimoto, Alicia Brown, Adam Heleman

To prepare the Assessment Committee for the 2016-2017 academic year, two meetings were held in spring 2016 to plan out how each representative was going to assess their respective areas for the following year. Please see the Faculty Senate webpage on the Leeward CC website to view meeting agenda, current progress, and Assessment Committee resources.

**Report #2: Progress Report of AA Degree Program Review, Evaluation, and Assessment Committee:**

To: Faculty Senate

From: Eunice Leung Brekke, AA Degree Program Review Coordinator

Re: Report

Date: May 4, 2016

---

**Background**

In Spring 2013, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the creation of an AA Degree Program Review Coordinator (Motion 13-06) to:

1. Form and convene regular meetings of an AA program committee composed of broad campus representation that relates to the AA program to discuss, recommend, and facilitate appropriate activities to ensure the AA degree is meeting the needs of our students.
2. Recommend and facilitate appropriate actions to respond to the findings of the “Assessment of the Associate in Arts Degree at Leeward Community College (2005-2010).”<sup>1</sup>
3. In concert with the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Office of Planning, Policy, and Assessment (OPPA) assist in the development of a systematic process that best assesses the effectiveness of our AA degree.
4. With the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the OPPA, contribute to the writing of the Annual Review of Program Data and the Comprehensive Review and Evaluation Report for the AA degree program that is required by the UHCC system.
5. Provide regular reports, results, and recommendations on the AA Program to the Senate either in person, or through the Senate’s Program Review Committee.

**Task force members**

Jeff Judd, Faculty Senate, Program Review and Assessment Committee, Chair

Susan Wood, Kathryn Fujioka-Imai, Leah Gazan (subcommittee on Written Communication)

Michael Lane and Blanca Polo (subcommittee on Critical Thinking)

James Fujita, Bruce Lindquist, and Luukia Archer (subcommittee on Cultural Diversity)

Guy Nishimoto, OPPA

James Goodman, Dean of Arts and Sciences

Eunice L. Brekke, Chair

**Analytical Framework**

Comprehensive Review, Evaluation and Assessment of the Associate in Arts (AA) Degree  
Analytical Framework  
Academic Years 2011 to 2015

---

<sup>1</sup> Last done in 2011 (2005-2010). See [http://intranet.leeward.hawaii.edu/system/files/assessment\\_of\\_the\\_aa\\_degree\\_fall\\_2011\\_final.pdf](http://intranet.leeward.hawaii.edu/system/files/assessment_of_the_aa_degree_fall_2011_final.pdf)

Due Fall 2016

Guiding Questions	Methods and Data Sources
<p>1. Who are AA degree students?</p>	<p>Demographics</p> <p>Pre-College Experiences</p> <p>College Readiness (COMPASS)</p> <p>Motivation and College Expectations</p>
<p>2. To what extent does Leeward Community College provide opportunities for students to achieve the general education outcomes?</p> <p>[Curriculum, co-curriculum, and pedagogy]</p>	<p>a) Curriculum Map</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catalog</li> <li>• Survey of the Top 25</li> </ul> <p>b) College experiences and perceptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Survey (Indirect Assessment)</li> <li>• Focus Groups and CSSE Survey Results</li> </ul>
<p>3. To what extent does the degree program achieve its general education learning outcomes (GELOS)?</p>	<p>a) Embedded Assessment Data – course level outcomes among the Top 25 courses (Tk20)</p> <p>b) Assessment of GELOs using rubrics designed for program level outcomes with signature (authentic) assignments across a sample of courses that target each outcome - Phase I: Pilot Study on Critical Thinking, Written Communication, and Cultural Diversity</p>

## Status

To what extent does Leeward Community College provide opportunities for students to achieve the general education outcomes?

1. Survey of the degree's Top 25 most enrolled courses completed (November 2014)
2. First Survey of Graduates completed (May 2014)

To what extent does the degree program achieve its general education learning outcomes (GELOS)?

1. Course level assessment is ongoing and all Top 25 course data will be uploaded into Tk20 (with some support)
2. Phase I: Pilot Study on Critical Thinking, Written Communication, and Cultural Diversity

Spring 2014

- Task force convened with input of the four division chairs of the AA degree
- Members were organized into the three respective GELOs (i.e., subcommittees)
- Each committee created proposed modifications to the outcome for clarity
- Developed definitions of each area (e.g., written communication, critical thinking, cultural diversity)
- Created rubrics to measure the outcome

Fall 2014

The task force began the process of norming, or testing for inter-rater reliability using the rubric to assess student work across disciplines.

- The written communication outcome, definition, and rubric passed the review of the task force
- The critical thinking outcome, definition, and rubric was slightly revised

Spring 2015

- The cultural diversity outcome, definition, and rubric was extensively normed with a wide variety of student work from disciplines in History, Hawaiian Studies, Sociology, and Art
- The AA Coordinator along with Lexer Chou, Student Life Coordinator, and three members of Student Government (Trong Dang, Christina Kaleiwahea, Rhonda Craig) conducted group interviews of graduates. The three groups represent both traditional and nontraditional students on both campuses. This qualitative piece supplemented last year's survey of graduates with an emphasis on student perceptions of what they learned (e.g., indirect assessment) and why or why not.

Fall 2015

- The cultural diversity outcome, definition, and rubric were revised and normed with a wide variety of student work from disciplines in History, Hawaiian Studies, Sociology, and Art.
- With the support of the Foundations and Writing Intensive boards, a sampling strategy was developed to conduct the pilot study.
- Inquiries to all Fall 2015 writing intensive course instructors were sent asking for participation in the assessment of the AA degree in the areas of written communication, critical thinking, and cultural diversity. A total of 177 student artifacts (papers) were collected representing 13 courses and all four AA degree divisions. A draft report was presented to Faculty Senate on 10/14/2015.

Spring 2016

- With the support of OPPA and the Assessment Coordinator, student artifacts and rubrics have been created in Tk20 and the training was provided to the task force.
- All three rubrics (written communication, critical thinking, cultural diversity) were normed once more among all participating task force members. Minor revisions were made to the critical thinking rubric.
- As of this writing, the task force has scored the majority of the data collected.

