

**Program Review and Outcomes Assessment  
Committee December 9, 2020 at 12:00 PM  
Minutes of the Zoom Meeting**



The following members were present:

Co-Chair Lisa HacsKaylo, Mike Nurmi, Wil Maui, Jean Castro, Adam Walsh, Dr. Yunzi Zhang, Ryan Castro, Resida Keller, Diana Hocog, Sue Atalig, Lorna Liban, Maia Pangelinan, & Geri Rodgers

Absent Members: Co-Chair Dean Char Cepeda, Alexis Cabrera, Tayna Belyeu-Camacho, Jesse Pangelinan, Nate Seng

Handouts: See links below

A. The meeting was called to order by Lisa at 12:05PM.

B. Summary of Old Business taken at the meeting:

***Adopt today's agenda***

- Motion to adopt as amended by Dr. Yunzi to include new business item about membership from Faculty and Staff Senate (proposed by Lisa)
- Seconded by Diana
- Agenda adopted unanimously

***Adopt Nov 23rd Meeting Minutes***

- Motion to adopt by Diana
- Seconded by Adam
- Minutes adopted unanimously

***Adopt Nov 20th Meeting Summary***

- Motion to adopt by Sue
- Seconded by Ryan
- Summary adopted unanimously

***Adopt PROAC Membership Composition***

- Motion to adopt by Sue
- Seconded by Diana
- PROAC Membership Composition adopted unanimously

***Continuation of discussion: How to Improve the Assessment Process***

- Adam opened the floor by reiterating his suggestion stated at the Nov 23rd meeting: instead of having all members evaluating each PAF's rubric, members will be assigned to different groups who will perform this task, followed by a norming session (to check for similar scoring or justification when there are wide differences). This would bypass the need for the entire committee to evaluate every rubric.
- Lisa responded to Adam that it seems to model the English placement test/scoring process. Initially, while it may be more efficient, for the benefit & growth of each other

in the group, the entire committee would likely continue giving input for each PAF's rubrics. However, the way in which we do it can be tweaked; it may not need the whole committee's approval.

- Lisa posed a question to Mike asking if he agreed with using the English placement test model for evaluating rubrics.
- Mike stated that he wouldn't use the norming session from the English Placement Test as a model because it didn't work out too well, from his recollection.
- Adam stated that the current process of evaluating needs to be streamlined since the future work will likely be heavier when more programs submit PAFs. He expressed that he doesn't know how much more time he or others can commit to committee work.
- Lisa agreed that it would be beneficial to work in groups, with a smaller number of PAFs. She also commented again that there is consideration for faculty members on PROAC to be credited for 2 committees (instead of one) due to the heavy workload. Nothing official has been confirmed or announced by Dean Char.
- Geri underscored Adam's concern about the volume of work, stating there were 34 PAF submissions this fall, with 10 that were deemed acceptable, but 24 that needed revisions. There were also 6 programs that did not submit their PAF, which would bring the count to 40 programs that PROAC would have to review, if everyone submitted the PAF on time.
- Lisa commented that as we build capacity, programs in the future will likely submit PAFs that will make the mark. Therefore, the review work will not be quite as extensive.
- Adam raised the concern that even though he enjoys doing the work, the pace at which we are currently working (with the three separate 8-hour sessions) is simply unsustainable. Something drastic needs to happen to streamline the work.
- Dr. Yunzi shared that the efficiency of the 8-hour sessions was not ideal. It was a struggle to fully give her attention during the last 4 hours of the day.
- Diana shared the same sentiments as Dr. Yunzi about the 8-hour work day.
- Lisa stated that Guam Community College meets weekly to tackle the work on a regular basis.
- She asked how members would feel about a 4-hour meeting.
- Adam stated that reducing the number from 8 to 4 hours does not solve the problem of resources and manpower. He suggested being more efficient with the time we have outside of meetings so that we can be efficient when we come together during our meetings.
- Lisa stated that during the first two work days, teams were given time to work during the mornings to work together, but then at the latest session, teams found time before the work session to evaluate PAFs. She asked for clarification about Adam's norming sessions and group work. Adam provided the clarification.
- Geri added that she is in agreement with having the norming sessions, with teams evaluating the PAFs since the committee was generally in agreement with the scoring and explanation of the lead team that presented.
- Adam added that the committee could randomly choose one PAF and present the rubrics to the entire committee to ensure that the norming was being done properly. This would replace the presentation of every rubric for every PAF.
- Lisa shared that the co-chairs of PROAC will want to be involved in the sessions to ensure continuity in rubric evaluations. Lisa asked Adam if the team work would occur outside of PROAC meeting time.
- Adam described how the team he was on collaborated via email.

- Lisa stated that she understands that teams may find using email useful and efficient, but there is still value in meeting and reviewing the PAFs as we have been doing.
- Adam responded that because of each member's personal and professional commitments, coupled with the lack of manpower and being on austerity (which impacts when we can meet), we need to realistically view how to do the work of PROAC, which may not be the most optimal way.
- Resida added that the drive would be a good way for teams to collaborate with completing rubrics individually and sharing them with their teams. There could also be a designated time for comments on specific rubrics, with approval of final rubrics at the next standing meeting. The collaboration could happen via email to see how each individual member scored the rubrics with consensus and final rubrics to be presented during the standing meetings.
- Lisa stated that when we reconvene in January, these suggestions will be shared with Dean Char so that a plan can be developed in moving forward with program assessment.
- Lorna shared that she agrees with Adam and Resida. She raised a concern that due to faculty workload, it would be difficult to meet on a weekly basis for PROAC (in reference to Lisa sharing GCC's schedule of meetings). She preferred not to meet weekly and requested to find an alternative to the 8-hour work sessions. She also recommended that OIE provide more assistance to programs who did not submit their PAFs, especially training with AMS.

C. Summary of New Business taken at the meeting:

- For the sake of continuity, Lisa recommended that membership on PROAC should not be tied to position with the Faculty and Staff Senate. She would like to recommend these governance bodies amend their bylaws so that it is more flexible, allowing the representative to either be a senator or a member at-large. Currently, the vice-presidents of both bodies are the ones assigned to sit on PROAC.
- Geri stated that it has already been done with the Staff Senate. Diana is the current vice-president, but because she already sits on PROAC as the representative from Rota, the senators then asked for a volunteer which is how Jean came to be the representative. The Staff Senate did not change the bylaws, but rather just made a decision "in-house."
- Adam shared he supported Lisa's recommendation, but he needs the support of Dean Char to help spread the work among all faculty, not just the few who seem to be on multiple committees.
- Lisa asked the committee if this recommendation is something that could be endorsed. Due to time constraints, the discussion will continue under old business at the next meeting in January.

D. Summary of announcements:

January Standing Meetings: Jan 13 (tentative), Jan 27. Meetings will continue to be scheduled on the second and fourth Wednesdays of the month during College Hour.

E. Adjournment: There was a motion to adjourn by Adam and seconded by Resida. Meeting adjourned by Lisa at 1:00PM.