**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date:** October 4, 2017 **2:00 PM to 3:00 PM**

**Location:** Hawaii Hall 208

**Attendance:** [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

| **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **MEMBERS** | | **GUESTS** | **TIME** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jacqueline Ng-Osorio | P |  |  | Hui-ya Chuang | E | None |  |
| William Chapman | P | Leticia Pagkalinawan | P | Mandy Westfall-Senda | E |  |  |
| Amy Brown, Vice- Chair via Polycom at 2:00 PM | P | Yao Hill | P | Stephanie Kraft-Terry | E |  |  |
| Konia Freitas | P | Monica Stitt-Bergh | P |  |  |  |  |
| Thomas Conway, Chair | P | Christine Sorensen Irvine, SEC liaison | P | John Kinder, Staff | P |  |  |

| **SUBJECT** | **DISCUSSION / INFORMATION** | **ACTION / STRATEGY / RESPONSIBLE PERSON** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CALL TO ORDER** |  | Meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Conway at 2:05 PM |
| **REVIEW OF MINUTES** | 1. The minutes of the September 18, 2017 had been circulated electronically for comments. | Motion by T. Conway to approve the September 18, 2017 minutes; seconded by K. Freitas. Approved unanimously. |
| **CHAIRS REPORT** | 1. Assign Secretary duties for todayʻs minutes. | 1. SEC liaison will take minutes today |
| **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** | 1. None | 1. None |
| **BUSINESS** | 1. Approve CEE meeting schedule 2. Assessment Office Update   Role to assist programs with learning outcomes assessment. Have workshops, leadership institutes, consultations, presentations, etc. Was recently asked to play a larger role in assessing student learning more broadly at the institutional level, i.e., assessing institutional learning objectives at the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as WASC five core competencies at the undergraduate level: written communication, oral communication, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking. Also have research agenda and service commitments as faculty members. Learning outcomes assessment at program and institutional levels - what are the learning outcomes want students to have, where in the program will these be addressed, what evidence can be gathered to demonstrate whether learning outcomes were met. More than testing and measurement. More comprehensive view of student learning. Sometimes make program changes based on data. University accredited by WASC. Standard 2 and 4 require all academic degree programs to assess whether students are meeting program outcomes and requires a process that is collaborative. Also require publication of learning outcomes achievement results. Collect assessment reports from all programs and compile them for accreditation. Goal is to help program improvement. Have been collaborating with IRO. Working on assessing 5 core WASC competencies for undergraduate degrees. Oral communication competency is the only one we do not have direct evidence yet. Need help from the committee to have more campus wide conversations about results. One of best practices (not doing it yet) is to gather data from employers.  Right now what WASC requires is 100% of programs need to set clear performance expectations, measure how well met, and use the results for program improvement for betterment of students. 100% of co-curricular programs must also do it. WASC does not set a percentage of students that must meet the outcomes. WASC set standards in 2001. Past phase in point. At Manoa have about 238 academic programs and only about 30 have not completed this assessment cycle. In WASC midterm report only one program was singled out. Almost all programs have someone assigned to be responsible for assessment process, but difficult getting buy in and collaboration.  At program level have 5 year longitudinal data for all programs. Have list of excellent programs (about 46%) and where they are excellent in. Has institutional assessment results for undergraduates and some general education results. Question of follow up and whether results are used to improve program - not yet systematically. Follow up with programs who have not completed a cycle of assessment.  UHM is seen as one of the best in WASC. Reasons faculty do not participate: time, no reward system, resources, technology, knowledge, not valued, fear. Some programs are really facing difficulties in terms of staffing and ability to meet basic needs, so assessment does not take priority. Another issue is helping faculty shift thinking from assessing individual students to assessing the program. A. Brown interested in knowing whether programs that have professional associations have met the criteria. Some programs are not accredited but could be.  Could review data and perhaps need to find ways to promote campus conversations about the data and how to use it to make changes.  The CEE committee in the past has participated in reviewing assessment reports.  Relationship between Graduate School assessment and Assessment Office.   1. Review past MAC/CEE issues  Issues from last year were Graduate ILOs and High DFIW courses. The first can be closed. The second the committee has not worked on since 2012. Committee will decide about this and what other issues it might want to consider at next meeting. | 1. T. Conway will send out another Doodle poll to determine next meeting time 2. Assessment Office will put documents related to the creation of the office in shared google folder |
| **ADJOURNMENT** | Our next CEE meeting will be on October 23, 2017 in Hawaii Hall 208 from 10:00 AM - 11:00 AM. | * Motion to adjourn by W. Chapman; seconded by K. Freitas. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:59 PM |

Respectfully submitted by Christine Sorensen Irvine, secretary.

Approved on October 23, 2017 with all votes in favor of approval and 0 against.