

**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

<b>Accomplishments</b>	<b>Concerns</b>
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

<b>DEFAULT FUTURE 5 YEARS</b>
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?

<b>DESIRED FUTURE VISION</b>	<b>ACTIONS TO CREATE VISION</b>
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**

<b>Inventory Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
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