

Revised Standards and Process Workshop Group II-7 Emerald A

Reorganize support structure? Carral College suggested:

- Title III grant to implement new database system and improve Inst. Res.
- Launched annual review cycle, dashboard indicators, use of data
- Purchased software – Datatel product “Colleague”.
- Datatel works with Sharepoint/Portal – cultural change to get people to move to this type of system for sharing and meeting.

Enthusiasm/Inspiration advice

- Commission responsive to feedback.
- Similar to other national systems.
- Reporting (will be) less cumbersome.
- Data, around core themes, will help planning and budget allocation.
- Less expensive (# of evaluators decreased).
- Possibility to bring people together to talk about institutional effectiveness – everyone is connected and can contribute.
- More reasonable documentation.
- Public process.

How Public should this be (from Commission?)

- Should be as transparent as possible.
- “About 50:50” at one represented institution.
 - i.e., assessment reports on intranet but not public.
- Ought to know your own data and use then to make decision.

“Data”

- Some moving away from “data” – “culture of evidence”.
- Data = qualitative as well as quantitative.
- Transparency, at the institution, around decisions = decisions are data-driven.
- Good results using term “judgeable”.
- Code commonalities from qualitative evidence (collaborative).
- Shared drive (at CC) for faculty, staff, and students to look at/retrieve data.

Steering Committee membership/duties.

- At CC, all writing by subcommittee; co-chairs of steering committee compile for continuity; give drafts to committee and to constituencies on campus (in preparation for addressing St.2).

Standard 2

- Don’t want it to be a rehash of old model.
 - Tie St.2 to core themes instead of functional areas.
 - Report functional areas under core themes.
 - This made sense to others in the session.
 -

Evaluation Teams : 2 visits in 7 year period.

Reports

- Focus different (from current model) core themes, continuous quality and improvement – ongoing – show progress.

- Bring positive outlook/aspect back to process.

Continuous Quality Improvement

- Impetus for change in process.
- Peer review process.
- Illustrating results (outputs).

Data presentation/electronic submission

- Pilots still submit in paper form.
- Opportunity to change to electronic format.
- How might we provide evidence in different formats (i.e., 3D models, etc.)
 - Fits well with a number of programs, especially for those delivered online.
 - Creativity options – YouTube videos.

Those institutions starting “mid-stream”/compressed.

- Advice (since standards not yet set):
 - Determine core themes, outcome indicators, data – rationale for indicators, start writing now.
 - Be flexible – start drafting, modify as necessary.
 - Basic process still going, but basic framework in place.
 - “Year 7 in 2011”
 - Ask for feedback!
 - Engage commission staff.
 - Initiate feedback process.
 - Feedback about core themes – fear of prescriptive approach about core themes.
 - Core themes mission – driven.
 - Be clear about how indicators address core themes.
 - 4 schools in Portland area on same “Year 7 in 2011” timeline are going to collaborate/work with commission (use pilot institutions as resources).

“Exhibits”?

- CC: organize around core themes (but hasn’t been discussed). Anticipates exhibits will be similar to current.

New Process – Excited or Scared?

- Mostly excited.
 - Evidence based.
 - Buy-in will improve.
 - “Natural” process for most.
 - Assessment writ large (but cautious about the detail – at this point).
 - Align mission with goals.
 - Continual process of evaluation/assessment.
-