

**California State University Channel Islands  
ASSESSMENT COUNCIL**

**Meeting Notes  
30 September 2010**

*Members Present:* Harley Baker, Caroline Doll, Steve Lefevre, Nelle Moffett, George Morten, Ed Nuhfer, Diana Smith, Judy Swanson. *Others Present:* Tia Clarke

**Welcome new members**

Nelle welcomed Harley Baker to the group and mentioned that a second faculty member, Marie Francois, and a student have also recently been appointed.

**Review of Draft Inventory**

A review of the draft Inventory Questions document commenced.

In an effort to define what is meant by terms such as “goals”, it was suggested they may be viewed in two ways, likely with some overlap:

Strategic Planning  
Operational Planning  
Annual Report  
Accomplishments

Assessment Plan  
Quality Improvement Process  
Program Review

Did we do what we said we would do?  
How well?

How well are we doing?  
Is a division annual report “assessment”?

Or perhaps it is more cyclical, for example:

|                   |
|-------------------|
| <b>Mission</b>    |
| <b>Doing</b>      |
| <b>Planning</b>   |
| <b>Doing</b>      |
| <b>Assessment</b> |

Attempting to gain consensus on the questions to be included, there was discussion regarding the value of stating a common focus, language and purpose vs. autonomous units where interpretation is left to each unit.

**Next Steps**

Nelle has requested the committee members review the current document and forward her a brief statement of perceived purpose for the draft inventory document as well as any suggested revisions by next Thursday, October 7<sup>th</sup>.

| Inventory Questions   | Yes | Some | No | Comments  |
|---|-----|------|----|---|
| 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 |