ACADEMIC AFFAIRS CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

March 15, 2012

Present: Geoffrey Buhl (Math & General Education), Jeanne Grier (Credentials), Peter Smith (Computer Science and Information Technology), Brad Monsma (English), Jim Meriwether (History), Elizabeth Quintero (Early childhood & Liberal Studies), Scott Frisch (Political Science), Virgil Adams (Psychology), Debi Hoffmann (Library), Sue Saunders (Advising), Kathleen Klompien (Writing Center), Marie Francois (Isla Grant), Amanda Quintero (Isla Grant), Phillip Hampton (STEM Grant), Kaia Tollefson (Vista Grant), Beth Hartung (Sociology), Julia Balen (Center for Multicultural Engagement), Kathryn Leonard (Math, Keck Grant)

I. Why the Continuous Improvement Committee?

II. Continuous Improvement Committee

• Barbara Cullin, Continuous Improvement Support Coordinator

• Director of Continuous Improvement

III. What do we need to accomplish by the next meeting?

• History Program Review

• Psychology Program Review

IV. What do we need to accomplish by the end of the year?

• Update MOUs

• Summarize your area’s assessment of institutional, program, and course learning outcomes

V. What I hope to do?

• Better understand and learn from all the wonderful work we do in program review and assessment.

• Build capacity via better support, workshops, etc.

• Avoid duplication and make connections between program review work and assessment across academic affairs.

• Better integrate program review and assessment work into campus conversations about budget and academic planning.

• Better use work from this committee to inform future WASC reports and visits to avoid duplicative efforts.

• Reduce paper and encourage an electronic workflow

VI. Next Meeting: Tuesday April 24, 2012.

Additional notes:

We would like to achieve:

Less duplicate work for Programs;

Send and keep documents electronically;

Have updated MOU on each Program;

Documents in each Program signed when submitted;

History and Psychology Reviews; Everyone should read them

Quick Summaries on Assessment;

Everyone was told to contact Amy or Barbara with any questions or if help was needed;

Writing Guide—expectations;

Money in budget for Work-Shops and to let Amy know if they would like to attend;

Program Review Work-Shops;

Programs should say what they want to achieve and any improvements to be

made to the Program;

CI is ahead of its counterparts and is doing really well;

Assess 5 core areas;

Self-Study is not matching and aligning with Rubric;

Alumni Data needs to be easily assessable;

Small budget is available for use re: Committee.