

**Manoa Assessment Committee (MAC) Meeting Minutes
February 22, 2012, 12:00 PM, Hawaii Hall**

Meeting started at 12:00 PM, with following participants:

Committee Members

Violet Harada
George Harrison
Peter Hoffmann
Daniel Jenkins
Sang-Hyop Lee
Adam Pang
Lilia Santiago (Cmt. Chair)
Amy Schiffner

Ex-Officio & Invited Guests

Tom Conway (Senate Executive
Cmt)
Kyle Kurashima (ASUH Rep.)
Aaron Levine (GSO Rep.)
Marlene Lowe (Assessment Office)
Monica Stitt-Bergh (Assessment
Office)

1. Call to meeting (Lilia)
2. Announcements
 - a) Lilia was invited to "Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) workshops" (related to WASC accreditation, one on campus Feb 29 and second off campus March 2); Monica will also attend.
 - b) Adam and George will attend an on-campus DQP workshop on campus (Feb 29).
3. Approval of 02/08/2012 minutes
 - a) George Harrison notes a minor error: George Harrison joined from "*Curriculum Research and Development group*"
 - b) Committee approved with single correction noted above...
4. Matters arising from the minutes (none)
5. Report of the ILO working group (Monica and Amy)
 - a) Institutional Learning Objectives
 - i) Originally MUGLOs were stated to satisfy WASC requirements; ILOs have been evolving from these.
 - ii) Amy suggested that ILOs are broadly applicable enough that they can be supported by individual program outcomes/ objectives
 - iii) Group drafted ILOs in reference to existing programmatic outcomes (lifelong learning, stewardship of natural environment, and civic participation are not broadly stated in all program outcomes, and may potentially require some curricular changes to support in some cases).
 - iv) Draft ILO were evaluated with respect to DQP, and some overlap was noted, but ultimately ILO stands alone without reference to DQP
 - b) ILO Draft for MAC

- i) ILO Draft hard copies were circulated by Amy
 - ii) Violet indicates that many of the ILOs can/should be covered in co/extra-curricular activities supported by the University (e.g., membership/ participation in professional societies, clubs, etc)
 - iii) Sang-Hyop noted that in a number of places there is apparent overlap among ILO's, and questioned some minor issues related to partitioning/ categorizing individual ILOs (Monica made note of specific recommendations/ items of discussion)
 - iv) Some issues were related to lack of explicitly addressing ethics focused requirements- Aaron indicated that there need not be one to one correlation between ILOs and individual curricular requirements, as elements of ILOs will be addressed in different ways by individual requirements.
- 6. Report on High DFIW working subcommittee (Lilia)
 - a) Lilia reported that they had a meeting last Thursday, but it was only an organizational meeting (e.g. summary of results from previous year)
 - b) Considered launching some projects, including continuation of the evaluation of the status of DFIW courses.
 - c) Also brought the idea of evaluating high grade inflation/ success courses.
 - i) High success in courses does not necessarily mean that grades are inflated (some pedagogical practices lead to more effective learning)
 - ii) Adam asked what the end of such a comparison would be (Lilia suggested it might be used to identify effective teaching practices)
- 7. Report on the Critical Thinking Workgroup (Peter lead discussion)
 - a) Group is meeting every few weeks, and they have evaluated now individual program outcomes map to individual pillars of critical thinking.
 - b) They were meeting with Assessment office to best identify how to proceed with establishing standards and how to evaluate achievement.
 - c) Adam indicated that group has considered more closely investigating venues where critical thinking is especially important (e.g., honors projects, capstone courses, etc).
 - d) Sang-Hyop indicated that in his program they evaluate critical thinking in a variety of courses/ instructors each year, using rubrics to determine student performance (300 level courses); Monica likewise indicates that any program that includes critical thinking in their SLOs must also assess student performance, so may be a resource for identifying best practices.
- 8. AO update and news (Marlene)
 - a) MAC Feedback on Annual Assessment Reports
 - i) Assessment reports from individual programs are due each year- describing how outcomes were assessed, results, and how results are used

- ii) process should benefit program by documenting activities, can help fulfill requirements for accreditation and program review
 - iii) records across departments/ programs can allow identification of most effective practices, and can allow identification of specific gaps (e.g. so that Assessment Office can conduct effective workshops to address deficiencies).
 - iv) Can help meet reporting requirements by WASC
 - v) What is missing? Programs are interested in getting feedback related to program assessment and assessment reports (46% of programs that submitted complete reports want feedback)
 - vi) First step- create a rubric; a number of assessment reporting rubrics from other institutions were consulted and used to compile a rubric for UHM
 - vii) Assessment office would like rubric to be reviewed and "test driven" on annual assessment reports (<http://manoa.hawaii.edu/assessment>)- asks that each committee member tests two assessment reports with rubric ahead of next meeting
 - viii) Sang-Hyop and Amy recommend having assessment reports record information on student majors and faculty numbers (Monica indicates that this is a good idea, but that numbers need to come from the Institutional Research Office numbers and not from the individual programs who tend to misreport numbers)
 - ix) George indicates that more specific feedback related to best practices/ examples might be helpful, in addition to reporting on level of achievement of specific criteria on the rubric; e.g., revise SLOs of program by consulting students or using other program approaches as an example.
 - x) Amy indicates that more emphasis should be placed on the quality of the SLOs and the methods/ approaches by which SLOs are assessed (and not simply addressing whether SLOs are available.
 - (1) Marlene indicates that some criteria do evaluate the quality of the SLO's and assessment process
 - xi) Some discussion occurred on how exemplary rubrics and assessment programs can be found (e.g. through WASC)
9. Adjournment at 1:13 PM (Next meeting on March 14)