Manoa Assessment Committee (MAC) Meeting Minutes
October 9, 2013, 10:00 PM, Hawaii Hall 208

Meeting started at ~10:05 PM, with following participants:

Committee Members
    Sang Yee Cheon
    Ian Belton (chair)
    George Harrison
    Daniel Jenkins
    Olivier Le-Saux (vice-chair)
    Adam Pang
    Lilia Santiago
    Amy Schiffner

Stacey Roberts (Senate Executive
    Cmt Liaison)
Yao Hill (Assessment Office)
Monica Stitt-Bergh (Assessment
    Office)
Aaron Levine (Graduate Student
    Representative)

Ex-Officio & Invited Guests

1. Meeting called to order at 10:10 AM (after Monica retrieved materials to make name cards)

2. Amy motioned to approve minutes; motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

3. Monica provided a brief overview of assessment and assessment office

   a) 3 levels: student support assessment (psychological and counseling issues, disability, etc); classroom and teaching assessment (grading, course evaluations, etc); and program and institutional level assessment (the purview of MAC- degree program assessment, program review, and accreditation).

   b) In higher education, emphasis is on program and institutional level assessment.

   c) Manoa Assessment Office was created in 2008 to facilitate implementation and management of assessment programs throughout the University, and help aggregate data for University level accreditation.

4. Yao provided an overview of program and institutional assessment.

   a) Assessment is outcome based- motivated by clear skills, competencies, and values that students/ graduates should be able to demonstrate.

   b) Curriculum and activities designed to prepare students to achieve the outcomes.

   c) Student work, presentations, and other activities are evaluated to determine if outcomes are met.

   d) Assessment of student work is analyzed to determine how the curriculum can be improved or outcomes can be crafted to better prepare students.

   e) Assessment office offers many levels of assistance for programs to successfully manage their assessment programs.

f) Ian asked how assessment data is used to demonstrate achievement of outcomes; Yao indicated that "direct" assessment is preferred- i.e., student written reports, research papers, laboratory work, etc. Indirect assessment, such as student self-reporting of achievement of outcomes on surveys, is generally not sufficient to firmly demonstrate achievement of outcomes.

g) Yao also indicated that much of student work is related to multiple outcomes- to facilitate evaluation of this work, rubrics can be created to enable quantitative analysis/ scoring of specific performance criteria of each outcome.

h) Monica indicated that focusing on, or parsing among, individual performance criteria/ outcomes can be difficult.

i) Ian inquired how best new faculty can come to an understanding of institutional expectations and acceptable levels of performance; Monica indicated that there is a Laulima site being set up with evaluated student essays from ENG 100 and various social sciences to serve as examples.

5. Monica provided an update on status of annual assessment report submissions (due October 11), and reminded MAC that they have agreed to evaluate assessment reports.

a) So far 86 reports submitted (37% of programs).

b) 31 of programs submitting reports have asked for feedback.

c) Last year a rubric was used to evaluate reports.

d) Monica suggested that reports and rubrics can be assigned by late October (Oct 21) so MAC can provide feedback and questions on Oct. 23 meeting, and target sending feedback by week November 12.

Motion to adjourned passed unanimously at ~11:10 AM