

HAWAI'I PACIFIC UNIVERSITY

MAY 2011 – STATUS REPORT AND COMPLIANCE PLAN TO OAA ON WASC COMPLIANCE: PROGRAM REVIEW, LEARNING ASSESSMENT & DISTANCE EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE

Nancy Hedlund, Ph.D., Associate Vice President of Planning and Assessment

July 2013 Document Note: This Status Report and Compliance Plan were distributed to the OAA VPA and to Deans in May, 2011. No actions were taken to follow up on the problems and plans in this document. In November, 2011, the role of the Associate Vice President for Planning and Assessment was dissolved and no further actions to address WASC compliance were reported.

HPU Educational Effectiveness Compliance Priorities:

1. Learning assessments
2. Comprehensive Program Reviews
3. Distance Education Quality Assurance (courses, learning, student success)
4. Documentation of Compliance: Program Review Portfolio

Current Standards and Expectations that Define WASC Compliance

1. WASC 2001 Standards - require learning assessment, improvements based on evidence, engagement of faculty, systematic review of evidence relating to student learning, and periodic comprehensive program reviews.

2. Recent WASC updates on expectations - include best practice statements/rubrics for evaluating:

- educational effectiveness of the school	- program review
- program learning outcomes	- general education
- capstone courses	

These updates are being used as site visit review criteria.

3. Online Systems Review Approval in 2007 - HPU was turned down by WASC on request for approval for fast-track conversions of programs to online. HPU agreed to meet specific levels of assessment that were articulated in order to reach agreement with WASC for approval:

- 2 learning assessments/term (4/year) with comparisons of location (main/MCP campuses) and modality (classroom/online) for all approved online degrees
- 2-3 reviews per year of online course quality, using the QM Rubric
- periodic review of student success in DE (course completion, grades, drops, etc)
- embedding of these activities into periodic comprehensive program reviews

Note: *These expectations have been reviewed 2 times a year since 2007, in every Program Review Meeting held prior to the start of classes and including faculty leaders and deans.*

4. The latest WASC site visit procedures for evaluating program review include:

- 5 completed program reviews in advance, suggested by HPU
- 5 more selected at random by the reviewers
- Supporting evidence, assessment reports, retention analyses, comprehensive report, external review procedure and report, and documented follow up with dean and faculty
- Likelihood of asking faculty to sit in roundtable and discuss their program review and assessment, with WASC reviewers observing “fishbowl” style to evaluate

Dimensions of the Problem

1. No response to requests for program review action:

January Program Review meeting: A proposed schedule to catch up on program review was distributed with commitments to course releases or stipends to support beginning the work.

No program faculty group or dean followed up on this Spring 2011.

Program Review – Proposed Fast-Track Completion Schedule for 2011-2015 (Assumes 1-3 terms for preparation & completion of review)			
Spring 2011	Fall 11 – Spring 12	Fall 12 – Spring 13	Fall 13 – Spring 14
<p><u>COMPLETE REVIEWS:</u> Comm ADPR, Journ Marine Science BS BATESL</p> <p><u>START PREP for 11-12 REVIEWS:</u> CBA – TIM, MAHRM, Accounting, Finance</p> <p><u>Natural & Comp Sciences</u> Env Sci (2 degrees) ✓Comp Sci (work started)</p> <p><u>Humanities & Social Sciences</u> – Comm, MA Comm, Justice Admin</p> <p><u>Natural & Comp Sciences</u> MS degree, Science degrees</p>	<p>Continue PREPs Fall & <u>COMPLETE REVIEWS</u> by End of Spring 2012:: Env Sci (2 degrees) Comp Sci TIM MAHRM Accounting Finance Comm & MA Comm Justice Admin</p> <p><u>START PREPS for 2012-13 REVIEWS:</u> Economics (2) Comm Multimedia MSIS MAGLSD Anthropology</p>	<p>FALL Continue <u>PREPS &/or COMPLETE REVIEWS:</u> Economics Comm Multimedia MSIS MAGLSD Anthropology</p> <p><u>START PREPS FOR 13-14 REVIEWS:</u> Marketing English Health Sciences</p>	<p><u>COMPLETE REVIEWS:</u> Marketing English <u>START PREPS FOR 14-15 REVIEWS:</u> Health Sciences</p>

2. Insufficient Assessment & DE Course QA Data for Renewal of Online Fast Track Authority:

February request for data from online degree programs for WASC Online Fast-Track Renewal application: requested 3 learning assessments + improvements and 3 DE course reviews + improvements; many programs could not produce any assessment data.

- No learning assessments or DE QA course reviews at all in multiple grad programs and multiple undergrad programs
- No learning assessments or DE QA in associate level courses
- Many program reviews seriously behind schedule\

No program faculty group or dean followed up on this Spring 2011.

3. Need for active teamwork to achieve shared governance accountability. This is not about one person being responsible for enforcing program review/QA standards. *It is about collective responsibility.*

The requirement for **Program Review Portfolios** has been on the books confirming that documentation belongs in the colleges.

No program faculty group or dean followed up on this Spring 2011.

MAY 2011 - RECOMMENDED PLAN OF ACTION FOR RESTORING HPU COMPLIANCE WITH WASC STANDARDS FOR ASSESSMENT & PROGRAM REVIEW BY 2013

1. Definition of compliance and actions required:

Every degree program must have a **Program Review Portfolio** that shows a record of compliance for every year beginning with 2006. The requirements include

- 4 learning assessments per year with comparisons of location and modality as appropriate
- Online course quality reviews (2-3 per year) where appropriate
- Program review annual and comprehensive reports as appropriate for a 5-6 year program review cycle

Actions to be taken to achieve compliance in every College:

- 1) Noncompliant programs must initiate an accelerated schedule of learning assessments and DE course reviews in which assessments are completed starting Fall, 2011. The accelerated plan depends on number of years of deficiency. The goal is to show ongoing learning assessment and course reviews since 2006.

Note – The assessments must begin, even if the degree objectives go into revision. Use the old objectives until the new ones are ready (should be do-able in a 1-2 day retreat at beginning of term).

- 2) A program review schedule for “fast-tracking” program reviews will be distributed.

2. Learning assessment --

- A. As part of implementing Blackboard, the work of learning assessments will shift in the direction of being more *separated* from program review.
- B. Learning assessment support will primarily be “led” by the Bb person, with support from Hedlund and CAIT staff for the transition and as a key element of program review.
- C. Support for learning assessment through CAIT and Bb person will expand to include support for assessment of
 - 1) degree learning outcomes and
 - 2) course-level learning outcomes.
- D. Learning assessment support will include degree programs, general education, first year programs, global learning program and the range of student support services – a plan will be created for including these areas and address in sequence over the next 1.5 years.

3. Program review --

- A. Hedlund will continue to lead Program Review support as part of my role and will provide direct support to the implementation of Bb to assure full integration of program review and learning assessment. Support will remain centralized through implementation of Bb.

3. *Program review – continued:*

B. Degree programs will be asked starting Fall 2011 to revise the degree/program learning outcomes to do the following (support will be available through a faculty member who will work with this project on a course stipend):

- 1) achieve alignment with the work of the Lumina Foundation, to differentiate associate, baccalaureate and graduate level learning
- 2) add outcomes for: critical thinking; writing/presenting; student success.

4. Distance education quality assurance:

1. Course Reviews: This work will shift over to the Distance Education (DE) staff who will be responsible for maintaining a schedule of reviews with degree programs. DE staff will assure that competent faculty are available for reviews and will utilize expert reviewers from other disciplines as needed (with compensation) to assure that the schedule of course reviews is maintained. The rationale is to assure that assessment of DE quality is under the leadership of experts in DE teaching and learning. The DE QA policy will be followed in all colleges including use of the QM Rubric.

2. Support for Technology Innovation: A key responsibility of the DE team will be to identify, evaluate and recommend innovations in distance education and online learning. While this has always been a University goal, a heightened focus on integrating innovation into DE is intended.

5. Way-out ideas --

A. Continue to use DE faculty experts to conduct course reviews where help is needed

B. Create a team of faculty experts in learning assessment and writing program review reports. Where serious faculty deficiencies warrant outside help, these experts can join with program faculty (including adjuncts) to complete learning assessments and write program review reports.

Preliminary Timeline to Achieve Compliance by Fall 2013

1. Colleges start “**Program Review Portfolio**” for every degree program – appoint lead person to coordinate within each college. Can do a course release/stipend after Fall work completed.

Format: Electronic or notebook. Eventually all must be electronic.

Accessibility will be addressed with access to Bb Outcomes.

2. **Fast-tracking program review (9 programs) commences.**

Lead person for every program, whether faculty or dept. chair.

3. **Learning assessments/DE QA course reviews resume** in every degree program:

- October 1: Assessment plan (program objectives & assessment plans) on file for every degree; curriculum maps are needed by end of next year.
- November 1: Complete 2 learning assessments & 1-2 online course reviews in online programs using QM Rubric. No delay over re-writing degree objectives – *do both*.
- November 1: Non-compliant programs submit a plan for catching up & completing back assessments & DE course reviews by Jan. 1, 2013.

Note: If this seems excessive or like “busy-work,” ask around what WASC sanctions felt like.

4. **Program Learning Objectives project** – Hedlund & a faculty member on course release will lead work to model the Lumina Foundation/AACU work to differentiate degree levels.

MBA program is already one leader on this.

5. **Bb Learn** implementation completed by January 2012

- Every course includes submitting student work via Bb

- All courses include option for submitting student work electronically

6. **Bb Outcomes training** completed with early adopters. Outcomes work commences Spring term.

7. A **higher education study group** will be named by OAA AVP to develop internal institutional expertise relating to higher education trends, impending DOE requirements and WASC 2015 Visit. Likely to be deans and leads for areas plus additional faculty or staff member from each area.
Goal is to develop leadership through knowledge and expertise.

What is this going to take?

Teamwork and collaboration

A shared governance problem that needs shared governance approaches

This is not a “one person in charge” solves the problem

Multiple forms of resources, incentives, support

Consequences

What is a learning assessment?

This is not the problem – it is not rocket science

Review student work using rating scales or add up similar test questions for a sub score

Rubric = rating scales, 4 points with words --- easier than a test question

Outcomes

Development of institutional competence and commitment relating to quality

- Blackboard

- Strategic Planning – decentralized planning to align with Pres. Plan

Restoration of compliance with QA areas: learning assessment, DE QA, program review

Engagement of institution with readiness for 2015 visit