

Senate Proposal for Change: Assessment Committee Charge

Issue One-Update Committee Charge: The Assessment Committee Charge was last revised November 5, 2010. That document is currently incomplete and out-of-touch with significant changes created by state mandates and accreditation requirements. These changes impact multiple areas associated with the development and assessment of curriculum and aspects of both these fall under the Assessment Committee purview.

Issue Two-Increase Committee Membership: The assessment process directly impacts every aspect of the instructional process and each and every learning outcome at the institutional, program, and course levels must be reviewed within a six year cycle. The current limited committee membership cannot provide the degree of discipline expertise necessary to address the diversity of concerns associated with the annual assessment review.

Rationale-Issue One: A complete and current committee charge is necessary to properly equip the Assessment Committee with the scope of authority necessary to accomplish their task.

Rationale-Issue Two: The required assessment process impacts every instructional department on campus. Increasing the Assessment Committee membership to include a representative from each department would ensure all departments have direct access to information, processes, and requirements that directly impact their area of instruction. It would also ensure that assessment issues unique to a given discipline would have a voice in the overall process. Finally, the annual review of assessment results would be shared by a campus wide representative body of discipline experts.

Background/Institutional History: Historically, there has not been a significant emphasis placed on the assessment process by either the state or accrediting agencies. However, recent state legislation and changes in emphasis by Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) has changed that reality. The assessment process has become a significant element in evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

Opposing Views: The primary point of opposition would be related to Issue-Two and it would relate to an increase in the workload for those who serve on the committee.

Response: In referring back to the rationale for issue two, the assessment process has a direct impact on every instructional department on campus. As such it is imperative that each instructional department provide discipline expert representation. The increase in membership would also serve to reduce the workload associated with the annual review of assessment results.

Solution: Update the entire Assessment Committee Charge and increase the faculty membership to include representation from every academic department beginning immediately. See attached documents.